

**BUREAU OF INFORMATION OF OFFICE OF
GOVERNMENT REPORTS FOR VISITORS
COMING TO WASHINGTON**

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and in his absence by reason of the fact that he has been called away from the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of the broadcast delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System last evening at 7 o'clock by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in which he discusses the question of lobby racketeering in Washington, and the victimizing of innocent persons who come here seeking information. He discusses the establishment by the Office of Government Reports of a central bureau of information at which persons who come here may obtain information.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now, you've heard of lobbyists in Washington, lobbyists for labor unions, for railroads, for sugar interests, for steel companies. Several years ago Congress made a rather sensational investigation of the lobbies that were being conducted there.

At the present time, however, there's a brand new one beginning to unfold there—the lobbyists' lobby, and I think you'll be interested in it.

Whether you know it or not, the average industrialist and corporation president and such people are the most gullible suckers in the world, when it comes to Washington. They pour into Washington by the hundreds on war contracts, they don't know their way around, most of them don't even know their own Congressman. They nurse a sort of dime-novel idea that the Federal Government is a fabric of string pulling and political pay-offs, and there's a new form of racketeer who has sprung up to prey on that idea and make capital out of it.

There are, of course, a great many legitimate men doing a legitimate job of representing firms in Washington on Government contracts and other business. I'm not talking about them. I'm talking about another sort of fellow who runs an actual racket.

For instance, a New England businessman came to Washington less than a week ago. He wanted to get some information about a piece of legislation, about which he'd heard rumors. He wanted to find out what the legislation was likely to be.

A casual acquaintance of his at home had told him to look up a certain lobbyist—that if anybody could fix him up this man could, because he had very important connections.

The businessman went to him. The lobbyists threw big names around. In his conversation Mr. Leon Henderson was Leon, Secretary Hull was Cordell, Harry and Jesse and Sumner and Harold told him this and that. When the businessman explained what he wanted, the lobbying gentleman got very grave. That was a very tough order. He said he had one inside connection at the Capitol that might be able to slip this information to him.

They got in a cab. The lobbyist had the driver stop about a block from the Capitol, and he told the client to wait there, and not get out of the car for anything. A half hour later he came back with a triumphant and very mysterious smile. He told the driver to go to the Union Station. Halfway there, very surreptitiously, he slipped a piece of paper into his client's hand and said, "Here it is; don't let anybody see you with this. Get out of town right away." The businessman looked at it; surely enough, it was an official print of the legislation he was trying to find out about. He paid very gladly a

fee of \$500, and he went back home happy, except for a little worry that he might get caught.

The fact is, anybody would have gotten that print. All the lobbyist did was to go to the bill room in the Capitol, ask for it, take it when the bill clerk handed it to him, and then go back to the automobile. But the gentleman from New England didn't find that out until he got home and then, quite by accident, and that's only one of scores of cases, along the same line, that happen every day.

Government officials have been trying to stop those rackets, and, to do that, Mr. Lowell Mellett, one of the President's secretaries, has set up a new general information headquarters, where visitors on Government business can get information about how to get information. It's a sort of general clearinghouse to tell strangers on business how to do this or that, or who to see, or where to go.

But that, of course, ruins the picture for the racketeer lobbyists, and so they're conducting a really high-pressure lobby at the Capitol to try to break up Mr. Mellett's venture. They've used every known method to attack it. They've called it boondoggling—that it's an attempt to control all information emanating from any part of the Government—on a censorship basis. That's not true. Businessmen, who know their way around, can still get whatever information they get now, direct from the Government departments. This merely helps the poor little sheep who have lost their way—baa, baa, baa—and gives them an escape from the wolves.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) declaring WILLIAM LANGER not entitled to be a United States Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. MURDOCK. I desire recognition at this time, so I may be recognized when the Senate reconvenes on Monday in connection with the debate on the resolution pertaining to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I do not wish at this late hour to detain the Senate longer, but I should like it understood that I may be recognized when the Senate reconvenes on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is entirely satisfactory to me, if it is agreeable to other Senators, and I have no doubt that the Senator from Utah will be recognized Monday.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair), as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

**WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION—
RICHARD IRVIN**

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard Irvin to be work projects administrator for Pennsylvania, effective March 1, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 13 (legislative day of March 5), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Admiral Ernest J. King to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 4 years.

The following-named rear admirals to be vice admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 10th day of March 1942:

Frederick J. Horne
Russell Willson

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Theodore Wanerus, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Buffalo, Wyo. Re-appointment.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 13 (legislative day of March 5), 1942:

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Richard Irvin to be Work Projects administrator for Pennsylvania, effective March 1, 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Father of mankind, we would open the doors of our souls and have Thee teach us Thy way and will. Give us the spirit of the Great Teacher of Nazareth, though a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief, yet He ever spoke of His joy and peace. There is a hidden strength in that which we call suffering and we pray that when misfortune comes and the winds of sickness blow, Thou wilt help us hold our anchor in the haven of divine mercy. As half lights and shadows, too deep for thought, are often cast on our pathway, may problems not daunt us, but lead us forward with greater vision and firmer faith.

We rejoice that it is Thou who softens tears into psalms, resolves discords into harmonies, and weaves dimming hopes into tapestries of ageless beauty; thus with our burdens and limitations may we be patient and uncomplaining. Knowing that all things work together

for good to them that love God, we pray for all upon whom rest the business, political, and industrial life of our country. Beset so often both in victory and defeat, in all their ways may they acknowledge Thee. Bless unto us all the bounties of Thy grace. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Nashville Banner, issue of March 10.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Board of Directors of the First Catholic Slovak Union of America.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution passed by the Federation of Labor at Spencer, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] may be permitted to extend his remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, recently I asked permission to extend my remarks and include certain extracts from letters and information regarding the Woman's Auxiliary Army. The Government Printing Office advises me it will cost \$189. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTRACTS FOR ARMY CLOTHING

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, each Member of the House received this morning a release from the War Production Board referring to a letter that Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, and Sidney Hillman, Director of Labor Divisions, wrote to me. If you will examine the Appendix of the Record, page A956, you will find these same letters were inserted in the Appendix by me, together with my reply to the Donald Nelson letter. If you will read that reply, you will find, I believe, some interesting information.

I also placed in the Appendix a letter from the Under Secretary of War, in which he stated specifically that the War Production Board gave the War Depart-

ment orders that the manufacturers of women's garments were not to be given any contracts for Army clothing, and that they were following that order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

OKLAHOMA IS AWAKE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, as I entered the elevator this morning the operator noticed the large bundle of telegrams, letters, and petitions I was carrying and he said:

They are waking up in Oklahoma, are they not?

I hold in my hand letters and telegrams bearing the signatures of more than 5,000 truly patriotic Oklahoma citizens. They are already awake in Oklahoma and have been fully awake for a long time. Among other things those folks say:

My pledge to help win the war:

I solemnly pledge that I will refuse to vote for the reelection of any United States Senator or any United States Congressman who does not consistently vote for a law outlawing all strikes in every industry connected with defense and who does not vote to abolish the limitation of 40 hours a week labor in defense industries for the remainder of the war.

Mr. Speaker, these citizens express the idea. It is true that only nine-tenths of 1 percent of the men in defense industries are striking, but a sufficient number are striking that it is alarming and affecting the morale of the public. We must see that something is done about it. The House passed a bill on December 3 which would really curtail strikes. It still lies dormant in the Senate. I understand our Senators from Oklahoma have been urging immediate consideration of same.

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PEARSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RAILROAD PRESIDENT DEFIANT—LABOR AGREES TO ARBITRATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, last December a dispute arose between railroad employees and officials of the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad Co. The independent brotherhoods of locomotive firemen, enginemen and railroad trainmen have agreed repeatedly to arbitrate this dispute. The president of this railroad has defied the Government of the United States. He has persisted in his defiance. He has repeatedly refused to consider the agencies of Government, in-

cluding the Conciliation Service of the Labor Department and the National War Labor Board. The War Labor Board last night again called on this company and its officials to arbitrate the dispute with its employees. In a formal statement, the War Labor Board very properly denounced the company for its "disregard of law and defiance of peaceful procedures" in refusing to heed the order of the War Labor Board heretofore made to submit the disagreement to arbitration. The War Labor Board reports that:

The Government has been patient; but there is a point beyond which patience becomes an act of disloyalty to a people who have seen stronghold after stronghold of freedom go down because men and materials to save them arrived too late.

The railroad brotherhoods are to be commended for their attitude and repeatedly expressed willingness of all these workers to arbitrate all differences. One hundred and four experienced trainmen have been deprived of employment since last December because of the arbitrary and un-American attitude of this railroad president. I want the country to know that here is a case where labor has agreed to arbitrate and where the employer is dictatorial and defiant.

Day after day President George McNear, of this railroad, expresses himself as being bigger than his Government. He is acting in defiance to law, order, decency, and justice, and in disregard to the public safety and national interest.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 16

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand that, of necessity, there has been a slight change in the program for the next few days. I wonder if the acting majority leader can tell us what it will be.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is hoped, of course, to complete consideration of the Agriculture bill today.

Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and following that the Rogers bill (H. R. 6293) to establish a Women's Auxiliary Army Corps in the United States Army; then, if possible, the conference report on the second war-powers bill.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Virginia will permit, the Chair promised the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMMERS] on yesterday that the conference report on the war-powers bill would probably be the first order of business on Monday.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Very well, Mr. Speaker.

Tuesday we expect to take up the legislative appropriations bill.

Wednesday we will take up H. R. 6750, the State sales-tax bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is that bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a bill reported out by the Ways and

Means Committee respecting sales taxes in the States on war products. It is tentatively set for Wednesday. It will follow the legislative appropriations bill. Following that we will take up the bill H. R. 6600, dealing with citizenship certificates.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it the purpose, if we finish this bill today, to go over the week end?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If we finish this bill today, it is the purpose to ask unanimous consent to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And I suppose the Private Calendar on Tuesday will be set aside.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It will be set aside, I am told; yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As I understand the sales-tax bill to which the gentleman referred, it is a bill to void State taxes on contracts with the Government on defense material.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

STRIKES DURING WARTIME

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days before Pearl Harbor this House passed a bill which had for its purpose the stopping of strikes in defense industries and sent it over to the other body, where apparently it has been placed on ice and received the kiss of death.

Like a good many of my colleagues I am in receipt of thousands of letters and telegrams demanding that Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Nelson be supported in their efforts to abolish the 40-hour-week law and stoppage of all strikes or walkouts of any kind for the duration of the war, and that production be put on a 24-hours-per-day and 7-days-per-week basis. So far as I know neither Mr. Nelson nor Mr. Knudsen have done very much toward stopping strikes in defense plants, or recommending suspension of the provisions of the wage-and-hour law for the duration of the emergency. Possibly the reason is their Chief does not approve.

I agree wholeheartedly with the objectives of these telegrams and letters, and have consistently voted that way. One nod of approval from the President and I am sure that the bill which we passed, even before Pearl Harbor would be lifted from its sleeping quarters in the other body and passed immediately. They ought to do it without nod, but apparently they do not intend to do so.

I do not blame the people for being aroused and alarmed, but let those who are responsible for this situation accept that responsibility.

As for my part, I am ready to act and act speedily and now, and will support any and all legislation which will give our Government a program of uninterrupted production, and I mean uninterrupted production 24 hours per day, 7 days in the week, and 365 days in the year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include two resolutions adopted by the Pomona Grange of Bedford County, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STRIKES AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is Friday the 13th, a coincidence of day and date that commands attention. It would be a mighty fine thing if something would command the attention of the membership of the House to stir within them a desire to eliminate these strikes that are hampering production. It would be a mighty fine thing if something could stir the President of the United States to assist the Senate in bringing out the bill the House passed so that we might stop these strikes. If we win the war, it is necessary to furnish the soldiers guns, tanks, ships, and airplanes, with ammunition. You can only do it when you stop radical strikers.

The Members of the House are beginning to get the jitters now because this is election year. Now they are for economy. Oh, what a change for some of you boys. It is about time you all get on the band wagon of economy if we are to win this war. It is essential that we all draw a sharp line between the essential and the nonessential spending; that we stop a lot of this boondoggling. Make this Friday the 13th of March a day to resolve we will save the country from bankruptcy. We will stop the radical spending, cut out nonessentials, and keep our country solvent, so we can furnish our soldiers and sailors the equipment necessary to win the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a resolution from the Lions Club of Spartanburg, S. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT'S NEGLIGENT USE OF ELECTRICAL ENERGY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was recently suggested that the people should reduce the amount of electrical current used in their homes and at their places of business, in order to conserve the electrical energy in this Nation. That is a

laudable plan, if it is, in fact, necessary that the people conserve in the use of electricity for war purposes.

If this plan is to be enforced, may I suggest that our own Government should set the pattern in this conservation of electricity. The street lights in the city of Washington are burned to capacity throughout the night, and often long after daylight. The Public Health Building, on Constitution Avenue, has a large number of floodlights about it, and these floodlights are burned all night to capacity. There is no effort made to conserve the electrical energy by our own Government. The vast amount of electrical energy which is wasted by our own Government will, no doubt, constitute the direct cause for rationing electricity in the future.

Mr. Leon Henderson has already rationed automobile tires; he is preparing to issue cards and ration sugar; and I surmise the very next step will be to ration electricity in our country. If this course is necessary to win this war, the people will not complain. But if this added form of regimentation is to be forced upon the people, let our own Government first make some effort to conserve the waste which it now permits. The floodlights on the Public Health Building, which burn nightly, make it a fine target for any foe. This waste must be stopped, and it must be stopped before the people are required to make another sacrifice to win this war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a message from Major General Richardson to the San Jose Civilian Defense Council.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

CRITICISM

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I heard this morning two of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle justify the failure to pass legislation to prevent strikes because of the failure of the President of the United States to so recommend. I think the President has a responsibility and I think he should exercise it, but may I say to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who made the statement that they are waiting for a nod from the President that it ill becomes them to wait for a nod from the President of the United States when they have not been following the President's recommendations on other matters. Many of us on this side of the aisle, believing that Congress also has a responsibility, have not waited for a nod from the President, but have voted for all legislation to stop strikes in war industries. I wonder if the gentlemen who made those speeches voted to suspend the 40-hour law when

we had it up for consideration last week in the war-powers bill.

Mr. RICH. Why certainly we did. You fellows over there never do anything.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Now, I do not yield for a speech. The gentleman makes more speeches than anybody else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And good ones, too.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Sometimes. Today the gentlemen cannot dodge and duck behind the fact that the President has not given the nod. I am in favor of the House asserting its authority and when the executive branch does not do it to go on without any nod at all. The House did pass an antistrike bill on December 3. Why does not the other body act?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN A. HALL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that Congress should not wait for the President to adopt and enforce a labor policy. We have now waited altogether too long. It is evident that the President does not intend to do anything to give us a sound labor policy unless forced by public sentiment to act. He wants to be sure of retaining the support of the labor bloc.

You cannot justly accuse us on the Republican side of being negligent in this matter because more than a year ago we aided in forcing through the Smith amendments, now chloroformed on the administration's orders, and reposing in the Senate graveyard.

True, a few days ago, Republicans did not as a party organization support the Smith amendments then offered. Some of us did. Some have grown tired of pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for the administration. Some have grown tired of incurring the ill will of labor politicians and of then having the President, through his friends in the Senate, render our efforts of no avail.

Personally—and I speak only for myself—I agree that the refusal of the President to do his duty does not excuse us for our failure to act.

The latest Gallup poll, clipped from the paper this morning, shows that the people whose views were sought were 9 to 1 in favor of legislation prohibiting strikes and slow-downs.

Let the President play politics. That is no reason why we should.

Since 1937 I have advocated legislation which would restore to the American citizen his unqualified right to work.

Now, when we are at war, the President refuses to compel the labor politicians to loosen their strangle hold on the honest American worker, but permits them, by his refusal to let legislation through Congress—and by the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court, they are permitted—to practice in what other citizens amounts to highway robbery.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE LATE EARL BREWER

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 40]

Arnold	Houston	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bishop	Howell	O'Day
Bolton	Jarman	Osmer
Buckley, N. Y.	Jarrett	Pfeifer
Byron	Jenks, N. H.	Joseph L.
Camp	Jennings	Ramsay
Cannon Fla.	Johnson, Calif.	Rockwell
Casey, Mass.	Johnson,	Sacks
Celler	Lyndon B.	Sanders
Cole, Md.	Johnson, W. Va.	Schaefer, Ill.
Culkin	Kennedy,	Scott
Curtis	Martin J.	Scruggam
Dewey	Kennedy,	Shannon
Dies	Michael J.	Sheridan
Ditter	Kilburn	Short
Douglas	Kleberg	Smith, Pa.
Englebright	Kocialkowski	Stratton
Ford, Thomas F.	Kramer	Sweeney
Gale	Landis	Thill
Gavagan	McCormack	Thom
Gibson	McKeough	Thomas, N. J.
Gifford	McLean	Tolan
Gillette	Maciora	Vree'and
Gossett	Magnuson	Walter
Grant, Ind.	Mason	Weiss
Hancock	Merritt	West
Heffernan	Mitchell	Worley

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-four Members have answered to their names; a quorum.

On motion of Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6709, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, debate on the pending paragraph had been fixed at 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 83, line 3, strike out "\$50,319,557" and insert "\$25,319,557."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to making so drastic a cut as 50 percent in this appropriation. I have checked over the Budget Bureau estimates. I believe this appropriation might stand a moderate cut, not in excess of \$10,000,000, but when you consider that \$10,000,000 out of this \$50,000,000 is allocated to grants, that means \$40,000,000 is left from which you must make your cut. If you cut \$25,000,000 from the \$40,000,000 allocated for the work this agency is doing, you will practically put it out of business. This agency has done too much good work to be put out of business in this way at this time.

I believe it is known generally that the House Committee on Agriculture proposes to make an investigation of the activities of the Farm Security Administration. I think it will stand some investigation. I think we ought to go into its activities which have not been authorized or which are unjustified. However, the organization has done splendid work among the poorer class of farmers, those who need assistance not only from the financial standpoint, but from the standpoint of better and improved farming methods as well. The worth-while and much-needed activities should not be curtailed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield for that purpose?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, if Members who have asked for time to speak on this amendment do not respond when their names are called, can their time be allocated among the remaining speakers?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be if they do not appear before the hour is up.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is most unfair. As pointed out by the gentleman from Kansas, the Farm Security Administration has done excellent work. Many of the issues are confused because of misrepresentation. I call attention to the fact that not only does this amendment reduce the administrative expenses but wrecks

the entire program as well. It will affect a great many of the services the Farm Security Administration has done so well during the period of drought and depression in the Farm Belt.

In the first place, the Farm Debt Adjustment Service will probably have to be discontinued on account of such a cut. The loan program and the grant program, which has been so necessary in so many areas of the country, will be drastically cut. In fact, we may as well abolish the Farm Security Administration as to cut out its heart.

The gentleman from Illinois has called upon the House to cut these expenses so that the men fighting on the Bataan Peninsula may have guns and planes and munitions—weapons with which to fight. I submit that the finest and most deadly weapons in the world are worth nothing if the men who man them are not physically, mentally, and spiritually able to use them to their maximum efficiency. Inanimate engines of war cannot alone produce victory. A classic example of this might well be taken from the world of sport. Everyone familiar with baseball remembers George Sisler, perhaps the greatest first baseman of all time. In 1921 he enjoyed one of his best years. In the winter of 1922 he was stricken with sinusitis, caused by dental infection. The following summer his batting average slipped to .128 and marked the end of his career, just as he should have been entering his prime. His armament was the same as the year before—a bat of his selection—but his power of physical coordination was gone. Once destroyed, it is not easily restored.

But what has this to do with farm security? Just this. One of the best programs developed under the present Administrator is the medical and dental program to enable families in low-income brackets to secure excellent medical and dental service. In almost all cases the medical and dental officers use the facilities of the area in which they operate. They use the home town physician and dentist and act as coordinating officers between the agency and the clients of F. S. A.

It is hard to see how anyone can consider that it would be in any way economic to curtail or stop this constructive type of assistance. On the contrary, when the Nation can least afford unproductiveness and displacement of farm people, this work is even more essential and the job ahead is even larger than the job that has been done. Farm Security county offices in Iowa report that there are 16,000 known additional families who need help but for whom funds are not available, and most of them could qualify for standard rehabilitation loans.

One thing that the Farm Security Administration has done with notable success is to reduce ill health and physical handicaps among neglected rural people. It became apparent soon after this program was started that one of the chief causes of rural poverty were the health conditions that made many farm people unable to do a full day's work. Clinical examinations made in 21 typical counties in 17 States showed an average of $3\frac{1}{2}$ physical defects for every man, woman, and child examined. The most

prevalent trouble by far was bad teeth. Seven out of every ten persons over 5 years old had decayed permanent teeth. Malnutrition showed its effect in the fact that 1 child out of every 12 was undernourished and 1 in 17 either had rickets or showed the after effects of rickets.

Better diets from home-grown food and better sanitary facilities and housing have done their share in reducing illness among Farm Security borrowers, but more was needed for many of these people. In cooperation with local doctors and medical societies, a rural medical group program was developed through which more than 100,000 rural families can now be sure of a doctor's care when it is needed at a cost within their farm incomes. Frequently such services include hospitalization, drugs, and, sometimes, dental care. The program of dental care, however, is still the least developed, although dental needs rank first among rural health problems. For the health and better production of these small farmers, for the protection of our armies which draw heavily for their recruits from rural areas, and for the Nation's future population which must be replenished from these rural families, the medical service and health protection that the Farm Security Administration makes possible to the small family farmer are essentials in the national welfare.

Assistance that makes it possible for our people to work out their own problems and to resume and hold their place as individual producers in the Nation's economy is neither extravagance nor relief. It is the soundest form of economy and an investment that is worth many times the small cost. The Farm Security method repays with interest not only the loans but also the debt to democracy and our farm people that all of us owe wherever poverty holds people down.

It may well be that the lack of medical and dental care, coupled with malnutrition among the underprivileged masses of the nations opposing Hitler, contributed as much to his success as any disparity in armament. We had been informed by supposedly creditable sources that the "ersatz" equipment of the Axis was inferior to the armament possessed by other Europeans—at least, such was the story before hostilities. The F. S. A. is attempting through its home management and medical and dental programs to contribute to the well-being of these people. The medical and dental service at least will become increasingly more difficult as professional personnel in rural areas is called to the colors.

It is entirely possible that the children of these families, now in their early teens, will be needed before the present emergency is over. It would behoove the Nation to have them in a state of optimal health if this should come to pass.

A tank operator with a batting average above .400 is a far greater destructive force than one batting .098. A machine is certainly no better than its operator.

But that is not all. The F. S. A. has been grossly and unfairly misrepresented to this House. It has become a victim of the half-truths and demagoguery of many who are jealous of its eminent successes. Even some so-called farm organizations

have stooped to underhand methods to destroy this agency which has done so much good. In the end it is the farmer and agriculture as a whole which suffers from this sabotage. Dressed in the cloak of the farmers' friend, the fifth column is on the prowl again, seeking to destroy a useful and helpful arm of the Department of Agriculture.

Let us see further how my own State of Iowa has benefited from the F. S. A.

While farm income has been going up, farm people have been going down. We have succeeded in good measure in bringing farm prices to parity, but we have not yet attacked with sufficient vigor the problem of disparity among the farming population.

Today we face a decision as to whether American agriculture is to be consolidated into great corporate and absentee holdings or whether its family type structure, which has insured benefits of the land to the people who live on it and work it, is to be preserved.

The Farm Security Administration was created to protect and preserve the family owner-operator as the basis of our farm economy. More than 900,000 families have received F. S. A. rehabilitation loans and guidance to keep them from being pushed off the farm by forces that have made for larger land concentrations. This type of help remains the one solid hope for the great mass of our small farmers to continue as productive citizens and not as outcast migrants wandering homeless in search of an occasional job.

But the Farm Security Administration has been able to reach only a part, perhaps a third, of the families who need its help, and the forces of displacement have continued to operate ruthlessly against hundreds of thousands of others. In the State of Iowa the 1940 census shows that we have not done enough to stop the trend toward large commercialized farming. In Iowa more land is in cultivation than 10 years ago but fewer people farm it. The number of Iowa farms without milk cows has increased more than 25 percent during the last 10 years, and the number of farms without poultry has increased 60 percent.

We find, moreover, that the mass of our farmers are going further down the economic ladder. During the last 10 years, the percent of all farms in the Nation receiving less than \$600 in gross earned farm income has increased from 28 percent to nearly 48 percent. In Iowa, one of our richest and most prosperous farm States, this less-than-\$600 group has doubled, increasing from 7 to 14 percent of all Iowa farmers.

When we are faced with these facts, we must be compelled to recognize that fair opportunities for the mass of our working farmers is just as serious a problem as fair prices for commercial farmers in agriculture. The Farm Security Administration has developed the methods to provide such opportunities to the small farmer and to help him make the most of them.

In Iowa, more than 18,000 farm families who were unable to get the help they needed anywhere else have received loans, supervision, and other assistance from the Farm Security Administration.

Out of \$11,550,000 that Farm Security has loaned to these people, \$5,370,000, nearly 48 percent, has already been repaid, and more than 5,000 borrowers have repaid their loans in full.

Under the tenant purchase program, 636 loans to low-income farmers in Iowa have been approved for the purchase of family-type farms. Their response has been amazing. At the end of last year, those with tenant-purchase farms in operation have repaid every cent that was due on their farm purchases, and in addition, have paid up nearly \$25,000 in extra payments.

But this has been more than a financial transaction under F. S. A. Standard rehabilitation borrowers in Iowa have paralleled the progress of F. S. A. borrowers throughout the country. A survey of the 10,000 Iowa borrowers on the program last year showed that they had increased their net income 85 percent since they first received Farm Security help. The average family income rose from \$609 to \$1,128. In other words, this entire group increased their total income by more than \$5,000,000.

One particularly significant thing at a time when we must do everything possible to enable small farmers to step up food production to meet wartime goals is that this borrower group in Iowa increased the food produced for home use from \$140 to \$235, or 81 percent. Included in this is an increase in milk production per family from 326 to 394 gallons; in fruits and vegetables canned for home use from 212 to 271 quarts, and in meat and poultry for home use from 295 to 492 pounds.

With the number of mortgaged farms in Iowa still rising at the time of the 1940 census, the F. S. A. has also helped to unburden small owners and tenants of heavy debts through their Farm Debt Adjustment Service. More than 5,000 farmers in Iowa, by voluntary agreement between creditors and debtors, have reduced their debts by more than \$8,500,000, or 18.6 percent, to a point where they could again farm successfully. These adjustments also resulted in the payment of \$300,000 in taxes.

Rural rehabilitation loans, as of Dec. 31, 1941

Active standard borrowers	Amount loan advances	Repayments	
		Principal	Interest
Ninth District, Iowa: 1,183.....	\$1,764,601	\$829,270	\$130,120
State: 9,939.....	11,550,546	5,373,644	793,724

Family progress, Farm Security Administration borrowers, 1941

	Before Farm Security Administration	1941
Ninth District, Iowa:		
Net income.....	\$550	\$1,220
Milk for home use.....	289 gallons.....	421 gallons.
Food for home use.....	\$133.....	\$290.
Fruits and vegetables.....	177 quarts.....	250 quarts.
Meat for home use.....	304 pounds.....	604 pounds.
State of Iowa:		
Net income.....	\$609.....	\$1,128.
Food for home use.....	\$140.....	\$250.
Milk for home use.....	326 gallons.....	394 gallons.
Fruits and vegetables.....	212 quarts.....	271 quarts.
Meat for home use.....	295 pounds.....	492 pounds.

Tenant purchase program

NINTH DISTRICT, IOWA

Counties eligible: Cherokee, Clay, Dickinson, Ida, Lyon, Monoma, Osceola, Plymouth, Sac, Woodbury.

Number of loans approved (as of December 31, 1941): 73.

Amount of tenant purchase loans: \$773,337.
Payments against maturities (as of June 30, 1941): \$31,773.

Delinquencies: None.

Extra payments: \$2,410.

Payments against maturities: 100 percent.

Average amount of loan: \$10,594.

IOWA AS A WHOLE

Number of loans approved (as of December 31, 1941): 636.

Amount of tenant purchase loans: \$5,798,738.

Payments against maturities (as of June 30, 1941): \$175,886.

Delinquencies: None.

Extra payments: \$24,036.

Payments against maturities: 100 percent.

Average amount of loan: \$9,118.

Farm Security Administration farm debt adjustment figures

FOR NINTH IOWA DISTRICT

Number of cases adjusted: 1,044.

Amount of debt adjusted: \$6,776,698.

Reduced: \$984,890.

In percent: 15 percent.

Accounting for taxes amounting to: \$48,386.

FOR IOWA AS A WHOLE

Number of cases adjusted: 5,279.

Amount of debt adjusted: \$46,118,362.

Reduced: \$8,607,361.

In percent: 18.6 percent.

Accounting for taxes amounting to: \$301,584.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. May the time not used by those whose names have been called without response be assigned to some other Member who may desire time?

The CHAIRMAN. If we run out of speakers on this list before the hour is up, the Chair will then recognize other gentlemen.

Mr. DONDERO. I should like to be so recognized, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what some good is being accomplished from all these things, but this is a time and this is a thing that can be reduced with perfectly good grace. You know what we need on the farms now are good hired men, and Farm Security has a tendency to take hired men and make something else out of them. Any man who is willing today to work on a farm can get a good job as a hired man. Nearly every successful farmer in my country was a hired man once. Let us dignify this whole thing and provide good hired men, and less Farm Security for the duration. Also high prices prevailing for farm equipment make it inadvisable for men at this time to embark on farming.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact we cannot have more than one

minute and a half of time, we might just as well give that up. I have some arguments to present and I do not intend to be cut off in the middle of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the members of this body realize what it would mean to the low-income farm families of this Nation if the program of the Farm Security Administration were pulled from under them at this time?

Few of us realize, I believe, that the people who are being helped by F. S. A. and who might be helped by F. S. A. in the future have enjoyed very few of the benefits of living in a democracy. And now, at a time when this democracy's very life is at stake, we are considering the possibility of doing away altogether with the one chance that these people have of coming to know what America can really mean to them.

This is not something that is purely emotional or sentimental. It is very real, and, let me add, very serious. The ramparts we watch may be protecting a democracy that has very little meaning to the people whose land it is. What a sorry spectacle that would present—a people out half-heartedly defending something for which they did not care or whose danger was no concern to them.

This can happen here. It is my belief that we would be surprised to find out, if we made a survey of disadvantaged rural people living in miserable shacks and struggling to make a living on miserable soil, that these people do not think very much of democracy. The reason is that they do not think about it at all. They do not even know what it is.

These people could turn out to be like the Roman farmers who, being asked by the invading barbarians which was the way to the city, casually pointed in the right direction and went back to their work. They had no interest in Rome, which had refused to take an interest in them. It did not matter to them that Rome might be sacked and pillaged; Rome had ceased to mean anything to them.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not accusing any group of Americans of disloyalty. I am merely pointing out that to a large number of our fellow citizens, democracy does not mean all that it should. And I ask you, was there ever a time when we should be more mindful of what democracy really does mean to us, more anxious that its deep value and real advantages be known and made available to all?

We need not search in the backwoods of the poorer areas of the South or the cut-over forests of the upper Great Lakes to find rural poverty. We need not always take the beleaguered sharecropper as our text. Rural poverty is nearer to the big, shiny white highways and closer to the thin, steel rails over which tons of defense materials are constantly thundering, than most of us realize. What a travesty it would be if in our haste to defend our great democracy, we hurried down the highways and thundered down the rails so fast that we did not notice the people watching us blankly and

without understanding from the miserably poor farmsteads on both sides.

Let me quote a few facts. The 1940 census showed that 47.3 percent of all of the farmers in this country had gross earned farm incomes of less than \$600. This would mean that the average family in this group, if he were a bona fide farmer, had an annual gross earned farm income of about \$350. After adding in a \$50 A. A. A. benefit payment and \$80 in cash from off-farm work, and subtracting farm operating expenses and the value of home-produced food, the family would have only \$17.50 in cash available each month—about 81 cents per person per week.

I ask you, is that good enough evidence of the problem of rural poverty? And can we well afford to think in terms of restricting the opportunities of these people for improvement in income, living standards and hope for the future by restricting the activities of the Farm Security Administration?

What F. S. A. does to help low-income farm families is well known to all of us. Its program of loans to help these families buy necessary operating goods, of supervision to help them use their resources most efficiently, of guidance in providing good food for the family, and of many other types of assistance is one of the most constructive programs that this Government has sponsored.

I do repeat, however, that even if we are conscious of what F. S. A. is doing, many of us do not appreciate the significance of this work. Perhaps most of us do not know what it is to be a farmer without a good plow, a housewife without a stove, a farm boy without enough clothes to go to school, without opportunities for getting ahead, without much hope. But there are a great many families in these kinds of situations.

Mr. Hitler has said for a long time that democracy cannot provide good things for its people. We know that he is absolutely wrong. We know that democracy is the only form of government capable of providing the things of value. I believe that the reason we Americans have never had any use for Mr. Hitler is that we know he is wrong. We know from experience as well as from our hearts and minds that he is wrong.

But there are some people in this Nation who do not know this as well as others. It is not their fault. I think that it is ours. Among these people are disadvantaged farm people. Many of them have never heard of Mr. Hitler and probably would not like him if they knew about him. But we have given these people powerfully little ammunition with which to answer his arguments. In their experience there is very little evidence that democracy is what the rest of us know it to be.

So I say once again that this is no time to consider retrenching the activities of the Farm Security Administration. Now is the time to make democracy worth while to the million or two million low-income farm families whose welfare and well-being is the long-run strength of our country.

We have recognized their need before. We have come to their aid and given

many of them a boost. Let us not forget those who still need our help now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, as far as farm tenancy is concerned the appropriations have never been sufficient to make any impression on the farm tenancy percentages of the country.

Fundamentally, the procuring of farms for renters is a desirable objective. The depression, low farm prices, and the droughts have caused more farm tenants than tenants have been converted into landlords. To meet this situation from a national viewpoint it is necessary to adopt a measure like H. R. 1422—introduced by the Honorable STEPHEN FACE, of Georgia—that provides 90-percent guaranteed loans. A measure like H. R. 1422 will provide an attack on the tenant problem on a universal basis, and will take the responsibility back to the localities where the tenancy prevails. These 90-percent guaranteed loans on a present market-price valuation will be a far superior risk to the 75-percent loans made on the basis of normal agricultural values. This legislation should be brought up for consideration.

We now find ourselves in a strained legislative situation. The people of this country are desirous that all nonmilitary expenditures that are not absolutely necessary be reduced or terminated. The public is serious about this.

On Monday the gentleman from Oklahoma offered an amendment that would reduce the payments from \$10,000 to \$1,000 maximum payment to any individual or corporation. This amendment might have reduced the expenditures some thirty to forty million dollars per year. However, an amendment to the amendment was agreed to, and the savings were nullified so that even the optimism of the author does not anticipate even a \$5,000,000 reduction. It is doubtful if there will be any reduction whatsoever. Is this action based on common sense and common justice?

Now, as long as we in our wisdom have seen fit to legislate so that the large landowners and the large corporation farmers may not be deprived of their \$10,000 to \$75,000 subsidy checks, it is rather difficult to expect us to vote to reduce the subsidy that has been granted in connection with the low farm income group of our farm people serviced by the F. S. A.

If we had reduced the subsidies to the big corporation farmers, which subsidy is questionable in peacetime and undefensible in wartime, we could, in fairness, say to the low-income group as represented by Farm Security clients, "Now put your house in order, too."

The Farm Security low-income group already live on farms, and are in a position to take an active part in an increased food program. Any parts of their program not directed toward increasing the food supply of the country, can and no doubt would be willingly suspended by the F. S. A. themselves. Let us try to analyze the following situation in our best judgment: First, we have refused to reduce the subsidies to the large farm

operators and farm corporations. In the past these farm subsidies have been condoned, explained, or excused on the basis that it was necessary to make these large payments to large operators so that the large operator could be induced to join the crop-control program.

What reason have we to vote these funds, and for what purpose, when we do not want to reduce or control production? Can you answer this question? In fact, we have a national program for increasing our food supply at this time. Do you know any good reason to abolish rural relief and not urban relief? If drought prevails and no food is produced, one may be just as hungry in the country as he would be in the city.

The public knows who has control of the legislation on this floor. The housewife knows who must accept the responsibility for all legislation. The public has a keen eye on all legislation before us.

The majority must be held accountable if it is necessary to put a ceiling of 117 percent of parity on hogs and then take a subsidy from the United States Treasury as an extra gratuity. Do you know why this should be done?

The majority must assume the responsibility of explaining to the housewife how it can justify \$10,000 to \$75,000 subsidy checks to big corporation operators when the products are parity or above. The majority must assume the responsibility of the yearly \$17,000 subsidy checks to Campbell and other big wheat operators, and must explain this to the housewife, with her continually shrinking purchasing power.

We are trying to pass a dozen bills in one. Millions of dollars could be saved if this legislation was approached in the light of available materials, priorities, and war needs. The lack of priorities and the shortage of farm labor will have more influence on food production than any other factor.

All legislation must be considered in the light of the all-out effort to produce food to win the war, and the sooner we use this pattern in our legislative efforts, the more will we be voting in conformity to the wishes of our people. Let us remember if we do not, others will replace us that will follow the will of the people. In the last tax bill you voted to tax the nipple on the baby's milk bottle. What can we expect from the new tax bill?

When this appropriation bill is re-committed it should include a provision to limit any subsidies to \$300 which is sufficient to pay the taxes and insurance on any family-sized farm in America.

The reductions already voted for Farm Security low-income farm groups, will assuredly justify this reduction to \$300 per farm for any of the large producers. In fairness, when this bill is re-committed it should include a provision to reduce the subsidies to the large operators.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am for cutting down ordinary expenses at this time and promoting in every possible way war production, but I do not believe the Congress of the United States should destroy the farm-security program that

has been inaugurated here for the benefit of the lowest-income group in this country and to whom the Nation is looking to do their part in the program for increased production of food that is such an essential part of our all-out effort to win the war and the peace after the war. Someone said here the other day that what the farmer needs is high prices and to be let alone; but, Mr. Chairman, there is a large group of the farming population that cannot be let alone and left to shift for themselves. I will not have time to go into it at length, but no one has ever been particularly interested in the general health of the low-income group in the farming population of this country until this administration took up the question. Last year a Nation-wide investigation and report on the health of the farm-security borrowers was made in 21 typical counties in 17 States, under the supervision of the United States Public Health Service.

These examinations were made in collaboration with the State universities, and by members of the medical staff, and with the assistance of local doctors, the expenses for which survey were paid by the F. S. A.

According to this investigation only 4 out of every 100 were in first-rate physical condition, with an average of $3\frac{1}{2}$ defects for every man, woman, and child examined. Seven out of every 10 had decayed teeth; 85 percent of all white persons between 15 and 30 years had decayed permanent teeth. Fifty-five and three-tenths percent of all persons had defective tonsils; 41.6 percent of all wives had one or more injuries resulting from childbearing and inadequate medical care. Forty percent of the wives and 35 percent of the husbands had defective vision in both eyes. One out of every 12 husbands had some degree of hernia. One out of every 15 children was suffering from malnutrition, and 1 out of every 17 children had rickets, or showed after-effects of rickets.

This is one thing that the rehabilitation program has been doing. It has sought to raise the average of the health of this group of low-income citizens of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, agriculturally speaking, deeded land is the American ideal, and the cornerstone of the F. S. A. program is to promote and increase small farm ownership and the live-at-home program. Unfortunately, the statistics show that small farms are growing smaller, and large farms are growing larger. Small-owner operation is growing less, and day-labor operation is growing larger. Twenty-eight percent of our farm families in 1929 received less than \$600 for all products. By 1939 that group increased to 47.6 percent. In 1929 only 6.6 percent of all farmers had an income of less than \$250 annually. The 1940 census shows that this group has increased to 19.2 percent.

One of the problems that face the country in reference to agriculture is to increase the income of the small-farm owners in order that they may have their proper share of the Nation's income.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, yesterday when the Chair made this list, certain gentlemen were on their feet asking for time. Apparently they are not here today. The effect of their names being on the list prevents other gentlemen who are here who are recognized, from speaking for more than a minute and a half. I am wondering if the Chair would consider a resurvey of the situation, so that the time of gentlemen who are not here may be assigned to those who are, which would give them time enough to express themselves. It seems to me if gentlemen are put down for time and do not come here to claim it, that that time should be assigned to those who are here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot tell whether gentlemen are going to be here before the hour expires or not.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, may I present a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HARE. Referring to the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], suppose, for example, I prefer to yield my time to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, am I in a position to do so?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot yield his time, but he can yield the time back, and then the Chair can allot it.

Mr. HARE. Then I take this opportunity of yielding back my time, and asking that it be allotted to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, if I get through with this minute and a half, it will be 3 minutes that I have had on this bill which has now been before the House for 2 weeks. There is some misapprehension among a lot of people, who seem to think that I am a farmer. I am not. I am a lawyer—and a good one. I do not want to be branded as any boulevard farmer from the State of Illinois, either.

There are just two things that you can do about these 700,000 farmers. Many are living in my section of the country. You can either pay them \$720, the average Government relief per family, and let the Government feed them, or you can let them attach themselves to land, and let them take care of themselves. War has nothing to do about this, except we should produce in every line, especially in producing food. From a business standpoint, the thing to do is to help those people help themselves. Where is the man in this Congress who is opposed to that kind of philosophy? Can we not all agree that every human being has the right to live, the right to eat? If he has, they are going to get something to eat in some way. When enough people get hungry enough, they will get enough to eat. It is easier to take care of these people by letting them take care of them-

selves. I submit in my extension complete and positive evidence of the success of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. Chairman, a vicious attack has been made upon a Government agency that of all agencies is most justified in the North and Midwest sections of this country. Because of some practices that have been carried out by certain officials of the Farm Security Administration, many in this Congress seem willing to condemn the whole institution which was originally designed to put landless farmers on their feet.

Before we accept the statements of the opposition to this bill, let us find out what the evidence discloses. On page 189 of the second part of the hearings on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill for 1943, we find:

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me put it this way: The 98½ percent figures were as of June 30. As of December 31 the collection figure shows that 99 percent of all maturities had been paid.

Mr. TARVER. Only 1 percent delinquent?

Mr. BALDWIN. Only 1 percent delinquent. On top of this \$5,205,000 has been collected on these loans; \$925,000 has been collected as extra payments made in advance on these loans.

Mr. TARVER. Now of the total amounts due and the total amount paid, what percentage of the amounts due have been repaid?

Mr. BALDWIN. Ninety-nine percent.

Mr. TARVER. Not considering the borrowers who have overpaid their commitments, but taking them all together, 99 percent have paid up in full. But the total amount collected is well over 100 percent?

Mr. BALDWIN. The total amount collected would be above 120 percent.

Now, right at this point, I wish to say to the membership of this House that no agency of the Government can demonstrate more success and less liability on the part of the Government.

On page 206 of the above hearings, we find the following evidence:

Mr. TARVER. What is the total amount of repayments that have been returned to the Government, together with the total amount of interest paid?

Mr. BALDWIN. The total principal collections amount to \$2,275,572. The total interest payments amount to \$2,929,653.

Mr. TARVER. Making a total of approximately \$5,000,000?

Mr. BALDWIN. \$5,205,225. Then, in addition to that, extra payments of \$925,312.

Mr. TARVER. That makes a total of around \$6,000,000?

Mr. BALDWIN. \$6,100,000 and a little bit over.

Mr. TARVER. That is on an investment of \$117,000,000, because nothing has become due on any of the \$50,000,000 you had for this year?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is right. On a good many of the other loans nothing has come due on them because in some cases families have not actually moved on their farms even though they paid for it maybe 4 or 5 months ago.

Mr. LEAVY. Your statement of the operations of this activity is an encouraging and refreshing one, though it affects very few farmers in my congressional district by reason of the procedure of distribution, and very few farmers on the whole in the State of Washington. But with the experience you have had to date in it and the results you have obtained, and several of those years have been

through depression years when agricultural crops have been making a low return, indicate that you have a program that has real promise to it. Now, I want to ask you this question: Have you been able to check the increasing trend toward farm tenancy in those years?

Mr. BALDWIN. The trend toward farm tenancy per se has been checked. But it has been checked in a most unfortunate manner. I would just like to give you some figures on that.

Mr. LEAVY. I wish you would discuss that.

Mr. BALDWIN. There has been a substantial increase in landless farm people. There are 6,096,000 farmers in the United States. Nearly one-third of all farm families have as their major crop food produced for home use. In other words, approximately 2,000,000 farms qualify as subsistence farms.

On page 208 of the hearings, Mr. Baldwin says:

The thing that has been happening is that more and more farm families are being forced into a day-labor status. They are not tenants. They are not sharecroppers. They haven't any hold at all on the land now except whatever hold they have as farm laborers, which is not very substantial.

Mr. Baldwin further states:

Estimated number of farms changing ownership as a result of foreclosures, assignments, or other conditions of credit distress, during 12 months ended March 15, 1941, in the United States is 575,000.

On page 210 of the hearings, we find the following evidence:

Mr. LEAVY. But in your justifications you state for the past 50 years the income of the farmer has been out of balance with the income of other groups in our economy.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LEAVY. And that the farm population, representing about one-fourth of the total population, has an income of only about one-tenth of the national income. Now, for what period of time is that taken?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is for the 10-year period.

I cannot understand why the Farm Bureau Federation is fighting this section of the bill. I should think they would be more than satisfied and even enthusiastic about putting landless farmers back on the soil where they can make a living for themselves and their families. There must be some ulterior motive actuating this attitude on the part of the Farm Bureau Federation. If that were not true, then their President, Mr. O'Neill, would not work so viciously to destroy this section of the bill.

On page 710 of the hearings, the Honorable Claude E. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, makes the following statement:

The Farm Bureau states that Farm Security Administration is burdening farmers with debts beyond their ability to pay. The best answer to this charge is the repayment record of Farm Security Administration clients. Of more than \$600,000,000 loaned \$254,000,000 has been repaid, even though most loans run for 5 years.

Quoting the Secretary again:

I am startled by the statement that Farm Security Administration has made flagrant attempts to build up pressure groups to maintain congressional appropriations. I have forbidden all employees of this Department to engage in work of organizing non-governmental agencies or groups or in membership campaigns for such organizations.

In contrast to this position of the Department stands the close public-private relationship between the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Extension Service. In some States Federal grant-in-aid funds are used to pay part of the salaries of jointly employed Farm Bureau county-extension agents.

Finally, the Farm Bureau states that the Farm Security Administration rigidly controls the farming plans of its clients and that it destroys the client's initiative and self-respect. This is a surprising statement. Where is the self-respect of people whose average gross income before assistance from the Farm Security Administration (for a family of five) was about \$700 per family, of which \$480 was left for the family to live on after paying expenses; whose children are ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed; whose children often lack elementary schooling and have seldom seen a doctor, even during periods of severe illness? Is their self-respect destroyed or improved when they find their efficiency increasing and their gross income up 41 percent; when they find they have 35 percent more for family living; when the value of products produced for use in the home is up 62 percent; when their children obtain medical attention and schooling; when they organize cooperatives for buying and selling, and, in many cases for the first time, take part in community activities?

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the attack by the Farm Bureau Federation has been amply answered and in that answer the design and purpose of the Farm Bureau Federation is brought to light in the following language of the Secretary of Agriculture:

In some States Federal grant-in-aid funds are used to pay part of the salaries of jointly employed Farm Bureau county-extension agents.

In other words, the Farm Bureau Federation has "an ax to grind" in its vicious attack upon this bill; they want to extend and increase their own organization through the county-agent system to their own advantage and use Government funds to perpetuate themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that all time has not been used, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot entertain a request of that kind. The time has been fixed by the committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the money advanced by the Farm Security Administration is reimbursable—that when this money is advanced to these people they agree to pay it back and will. The record of the Farm Security Administration in the State of Idaho is all to the good, and the record of the Farm Security Administration in taking people off relief and putting them on the land where they may become self-supporting in Idaho is all to the good. When our great apple-growing industry was ruined by a disastrous freeze, when the banks and all the farmers were loaded with obligations which they could not meet, it was the Farm Security Administration that stepped into the breach and by making loans saved the great apple-growing industry of southern Idaho. If we had not had such an organization we would have lost an industry that had been built up with years of labor.

If this was an appropriation for the R. F. C., we would pass it very quickly by 100 percent, but here we are trying to deprive the poorest lot of people of an opportunity to help themselves. Let us continue to help them go into the stump land of the West, let us make the necessary advances to these farm families, and let them do as our forefathers did—dig their living out of the ground and become self-supporting and go forward in the work of building homes and communities, and a successful agriculture. This is a great movement—one of the greatest things undertaken by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the author of the amendment if by cutting \$25,000,000 off the \$50,000,000 that would affect any of the rehabilitation loans and grants to farmers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman indulge me long enough to answer that completely?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would be rather interesting if a great many people would first inform themselves before they go into the Well to talk about this matter. This is administrative money. This involves mileage. This involves nineteen thousand on the pay roll. This is not concerned with loans whatever.

Mr. STEFAN. How about the farm debt adjustment and rural rehabilitation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is involved. Those are all personal services, \$50,000,000 worth, including mileage.

Mr. STEFAN. I have a lot of farmers who are willing to cut some of these unnecessary administrative expenses. We should know just what we are doing here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is what this is. The loans come in the next paragraph.

Mr. STEFAN. We should not cut this item right in half without knowing just what items in the farm rehabilitation program will be affected. I am informed that by cutting this item in half we will have to eliminate or cut down much of the rural rehabilitation work; grants to needy farmers; farm-debt adjustment and servicing of the loans. I have gone along on some cuts which I felt were justified. But I do not want to destroy the entire program. The committee brought this bill out with a figure which was over \$500,000,000 less than the figure of last year. That was a pretty good cut in a farm appropriation bill. Up to this time about a hundred million dollars more have been cut out of the bill. There are limitations here which will prohibit anything like collective farm operations. There are many other safeguards.

The reductions in this bill are heavier than in some other appropriation bills we have had thus far. It is a bill making annual appropriations for the entire Department of Agriculture. I am sure most of the farmers in my district will agree that some of these cuts are justified. But I am sure that they do not want to destroy all of the program.

I feel that I know what our farmers want today. They agree with us that all unnecessary expenditures should be eliminated. They want nondefense expenditures cut. They are opposed to unnecessary travel, administrative expense, and too many officials, but they are not opposed to useful and helpful activity which will aid in fitting the farmer into the war program. The farmers in my State are among the most patriotic Americans in our country. They are not complacent. They want efficiency and economy in the distribution of Federal funds. They want the frills and nonessentials eliminated.

What our farmers need today is a good hired man or two who will actually work so that the farm can produce the things our Government says we need for our armed forces and also that we can feed our civilians and the millions in foreign lands who are looking to the American farmer for help.

I have heard very little complaint against this particular item. I have heard complaints against some useless administrative activities and the committee can cut this item to some extent. But a deliberate cut like this, in my opinion, is a little too drastic.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the committee itself has placed restrictions in this bill with regard to certain activities of this administration that have been objected to heretofore. Those matters are already taken care of.

This is the only part of this farm program that applies to the really poor farmers who cannot in the nature of the case increase their production in the way they are being asked to do under the food-for-freedom program unless they get assistance in this program. This poorest group of farmers are being counted on to produce 35 percent of the additional pork needed, 40 percent of the eggs, 50 percent of the tomatoes, and so on. They are part and parcel of the food-for-freedom program.

The gentleman contends that his amendment applies only to administrative expenses. But I read from the Appropriations Committee's own breakdown of this item. All of the \$10,000,000 for grants is included in this \$50,000,000 item. Not one cent of that \$10,000,000 is for administration. It is all for helping these poor farmers and their families in cases of outright and absolute distress. Seventy million dollars for loans is in another item, that is true, but all the grant money is here.

How does the gentleman expect this agency to make loans unless they service them? How does he expect the loans to be repaid unless they are serviced? So far the Farm Security Administration has made loans in a total amount of \$560,000,000 to some 738,000 poor farm families. It costs about \$40 per borrower per year to service these loans. For my part, I think that is a very important part of this program. Without the improved working of the farms, the

loans themselves are not likely to yield any of the beneficial results which otherwise they can yield.

The whole amount of money for the agricultural labor camps is involved in this item also. This item is not all administrative expense—not by any means. Those camps are for the people who lose out at trying to farm in some of the sections represented by other members and come to my country. For my part, I want them to at least have a floor to pitch their tent on and a place where they can wash their clothes when they get there. It is true that a portion of this money is for administration. By no means all of it is. The effect of the amendment will be to hamstring the constructive program of helping one-crop poor farm families to plant other crops, grow gardens, raise a little livestock, and really get on their feet.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in this situation today: I would like to vote for a reduction of these administrative expenses. I think they should be reduced, but I do not believe the committee should support this 50-percent reduction. It goes too far. The Farm Security Administration has rendered real service to hundreds of thousands of low-income farmers in practically every State in the Union. It has been especially helpful in Kansas where we have had severe crop failures the last few years. It has taken a group of farmers that were unable to secure financial assistance from local banking institutions and rehabilitated them. During the past few days I have had a large number of telegrams and letters from leading bankers in the Sixth District asking me to support the appropriation for the continuance of Farm Security. One banker advised me there were 150 farm families in his county that could not be financed except for this agency. It is my thought that it is much better to continue the rehabilitation-loan program of the Farm Security Administration and provide assistance for these farmers than force them off the farms on the W. P. A. or some other relief agency. The Farm Security Administration is like every other Federal agency. They started out with the laudable purpose of rehabilitating farm families and working out a debt-adjustment program among the low-income farm group. They are now carrying on many valid activities that are not related to the rehabilitation of farm families. It is my thought that reductions can and should be made in these categories. The Sixth Congressional District is served by the regional offices in Lincoln, Nebr., and Amarillo, Tex. In my opinion these regional offices have handled the administration of this program in a very excellent way. During the past few years I have had few complaints in regard to their administration. They no doubt have made mistakes. At a time when our citizens are demanding reductions in expenditures, I am certain they will further eliminate waste and extravagance. Let us reduce the administrative

costs of this agency, but let us not in any way interfere with the loans to the individual farm families.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, a strong case is being made against the appropriation of \$50,000,000 for administrative expenses. Let me point out that \$50,000,000 is not contained in this item for administrative expenses alone. Other items are involved. For instance you have the cost of the supervision of migratory camps. You have millions set aside for grants, a necessary part of the Farm Security program. When these items are taken from the \$50,000,000 you have approximately thirty-two or thirty-three millions for administrative expenses. Funds for administrative expenses thus are more than one-third lower than is indicated by the language of the bill. Now, it is also very important that we realize that the money available for administrative expenses is not being used just for the supervision of \$70,000,000 of rehabilitation loans, as has been stated and for no other purposes. It is also being used for the continuing supervision of approximately \$400,000,000 of long-time rehabilitation loans. These loans were made in previous years for periods up to 5 years. In many cases no additional money is to be loaned to these people this year, but the supervision must continue to insure most advantageous use of funds and greatest benefit to borrowers.

Please do not forget that supervision is still required for approximately \$212,000,000 in old tenant purchase loans, and for \$140,000,000 in old resettlement projects inherited by the Farm Security Administration. In addition there is the item of supervision of 65 migratory labor camps now in operation and some 40 new ones under construction. All told, you have supervision of approximately \$900,000,000 of Federal money, money belonging to the people of the United States which has been advanced on this program. Not \$70,000,000, as the proponents of the amendment insist, but \$900,000,000, affecting half a million deserving farm families. This great investment in the future security of our Nation is too important to be jeopardized by unjustifiable cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, in the 1940 fiscal year the Farm Security Administration made rehabilitation loans to 299,000 families, and it had loans outstanding to 668,902 families on January 1, 1940. Source: F. S. A. annual report, 1940; and Agricultural Statistics, 1941, United States Department of Agriculture. The F. S. A. now has approximately 759,000 rehabilitation loans outstanding. Testimony of F. S. A. Administrator Baldwin, page 965, transcript of hearings, February 13, 1942, Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures.

In 1943, with greatly improved farm income, the number of clients needing assistance will probably be much smaller.

Nevertheless, the 1943 Budget provides a great increase in the number of permanent field employees and in the expenditures for field personnel above the amount expended in 1940.

The 1943 Budget allows a total of 13,821 permanent field employees at a cost of \$24,070,064, compared to 9,686 permanent field employees at a cost of \$14,043,740 in the year 1940. Thus, the Budget for 1943 allows 43 percent more permanent field employees and 71 percent more expenditures for this purpose than in 1940, yet the total number of clients to be served in 1943 should be very much reduced below 1940, if assistance is restricted to legitimate need.

The general overhead costs of administration are likewise allowed a larger amount in 1943 than in 1940, although the increase here is much smaller.

The 1943 Budget allows a total of \$18,705,623 for the farm and home management services of F. S. A., compared to a total of \$11,871,196 for this purpose in 1940—an increase of approximately 60 percent in the expenditures for this purpose, when the number of clients should be smaller.

Similarly, the 1943 Budget allows a total of \$12,533,204 for expenditures for investigations of applications, and making, collecting, and servicing loans and grants, whereas the total expenditures for this purpose in 1940 amounted to \$7,431,543—an increase of about 66 percent in 1943 above 1940.

Despite the greatly improved situation with respect to farm prices and farm income, the 1943 Budget allows a total of \$1,796,580 for debt adjustment activities, compared to a total of \$1,902,953 expended for this purpose in 1940. Here again most of this money is expended for field personnel. Of the total amount allowed for this purpose in the 1943 Budget, \$1,385,365 is to be expended for 640 field employees and \$237,000 for temporary field employees—included in foregoing total.

In the fiscal year 1940 the F. S. A. had 1,077 employees in its Washington office, 3,497 employees in its 12 regional offices, 437 employees in its 42 State offices, 554 employees in its 222 district offices within the States, and 8,825 employees in its 2,097 county offices. These employees were engaged in the rural rehabilitation program and does not represent a complete roster of employees.

The 1943 Budget allows a total of 19,448 permanent field employees, at a cost of \$34,131,375, compared to 14,586 permanent field employees in 1940 at a cost of \$22,119,347.

The total expenses for personal services, travel, and all other purposes except loans and grants, which are allowed in the 1943 Budget, amount to \$44,346,282.

It is significant to compare these costs and the number of personnel required to carry out the F. S. A. rural rehabilitation program with the cost and number of personnel required by the Farm Credit Administration to carry out its program of crop and feed loans. Both of these types of loans are made to low-income families which cannot obtain credit elsewhere, yet the total cost of administration of crop and feed loans totals only

about \$3,500,000 and requires only about 1,200 employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, with reference to supervision in Oklahoma the Farm Security Administration has only 409 employees. That is not very many for the 86,000 clients in Oklahoma besides the 900 that come under the operation of the Bankhead-Jones Act. These 409 are a very patriotic group of employees—as are the 86,000 clients. Everyone of these 409 employees, unlike most organizations have bought Defense bonds to the extent of 15 percent of their salaries.

I believe we should cut some nondefense and nonessential spending from all appropriations, but I tell you that there are more nondefense items in some of these so-called defense appropriations than any other place. I will tell you something the people want cut: They desire to cut out these strikes; they want to suspend the 40-hour law during the emergency and extend the working hours in defense industries to the extent that plants will operate continually with three shifts of men. They rightfully feel that other laborers desiring to work may be permitted to do so without having to pay a high tribute to labor leaders.

I hold in my arms telegrams and letters received during the last 2 days containing over 5,000 signatures of people who want to cut out these strikes. We have passed a bill exactly 100 days ago that will do that, and have laid that bill on the doorstep of the Senate. It is up to the Senate now. I do not place the blame on our two Oklahoma Senators. I understand they have been urging consideration of same.

I am for a program of reduced expenditures, but why start at this late date on the farmer only right now? Why do we not cut out \$34,000,000 for the building across the creek? Why do we not cut out the \$70,000,000 for building defense houses here in Washington when there would have been no need of additional defense housing if the defense program had been fully decentralized, placing more of these defense industries out in the various States, especially the Southwest?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, there is one test I think we should apply to all proposals for appropriation of money: Is this appropriation essential to the defense program of this Nation? If it is not essential to the defense program, we ought to vote against it and deny it. I notice that 140 pages of the hearings have been devoted to this section of the bill. Before any Member of this House votes against the Dirksen amendment I commend to him a reading of the statement by Mr. O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau, on page 618 of the hearings, in which he states among other things the following:

We have had so many complaints of waste, extravagance, and abuses in the administra-

tion of the Farm Security Administration programs that we felt it advisable to have a preliminary investigation made. While we did not have the time nor the facilities to make a complete investigation, the preliminary findings indicate some startling and shocking conditions of waste, extravagance, and indefensible practices in the administration of these programs, including:

1. Assignment of quotas of the number of clients to be secured in counties in order to expend funds appropriated by Congress and to maintain personnel employed by the agency.

2. Widespread solicitation of clients in order to meet quotas.

3. Burdening of clients with excessive loans beyond their ability ever to repay, resulting in a complete loss of hope and in break-down of morale.

4. Establishment of impractical collective-farming projects.

5. The policy of making grant payments from Federal emergency relief funds, for which the Farm Security appears to be a certifying agency, as a means of enabling clients to repay loans rather than using such funds to relieve destitution, and in this way substituting funds intended for direct relief to repay loans which have become delinquent.

6. Use of numerous devices, such as the substitution of grant payments, renewal notes, and the 5-year and 10-year variable payment plans as a means of showing that loans have been collected when actually little or no collections have been made; or in many cases showing loans fully paid where the indebtedness of the borrowers has actually been increased.

7. Flagrant attempts to build up pressure groups to maintain congressional appropriations and local political and community support through various devices and practices.

8. Instances of refusal to accept payment of indebtedness in full or to make full reimbursement of overpayments evidently for the purpose of maintaining governmental control over the individual; and

9. Right control of business and farming plans of the clients, amounting to complete regimentation, and in this way destroying the initiative and self-respect of the clients.

The American Farm Bureau is one of the great farmers' organizations of the country. The statement I have quoted is the voice of the farmers themselves, speaking and expressing their views against the waste and indefensible practices of the Farm Security Administration.

Think of it! Taking relief money belonging to the Government, voted by Congress for help to those in need, and giving it to those who borrowed money from the Government in order that they may pay back such loans to the Government. That practice is indefensible and senseless. The policy of holding out grants, loans, and subsidies is making beggars out of the American people. They must ask Washington for everything and anything. Their morale and independence is being destroyed and their republican form of government will be destroyed by it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment for information.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 83, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "and (6) projects involving construction and operation of migratory labor camps."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, this morning's paper contains headlines to the effect that General Hershey has said:

Now is the time to mobilize every citizen of this country to engage in some part of this defense program in order that we might be able to win this war.

I cannot get through my mind the common sense of voting yesterday to take out millions which will perhaps drive farmers away from the farms, then spending millions to build camps to induce people to migrate and go there at the expense of the taxpayers and the Treasury of the United States. This is no time for the building of migratory camps and inducing labor to sit down at the expense of the Government. There are plenty of places on the farm today for people who want to work. One of the serious problems of our farmers is the labor shortage. These people can find work regardless of what section of the country they are from or where they are located at this time.

If my amendment is agreed to, you will save several millions which may go back to the farmers that we are trying to help and to those people who work and not for those who might be delighted to have the Government build beautiful camps, entertain and feed them at the expense of the taxpayers.

I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I cannot cover my subject in a minute and a half. I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that an amendment I will offer be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 83, line 3, strike out "\$50,319,557" and insert "\$47,088,693."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, because no one can tell what the situation will be after the vote on the Dirksen amendment, I will offer the customary travel amendment to reduce by about three and a half million dollars this fund for travel. So that the House may know my feelings, may I say that my State receives more good from the Farm Security Administration than from all the other activities of the Department of Agriculture combined. I cannot possibly agree to cut as deeply as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] seeks to do, because you will be taking out of the hides of those who can least afford it services

that are helpful in rehabilitating them and making them self-sustaining families.

If someone will offer an amendment to cut it a less amount, 10 to 15 percent, I will support the amendment. The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that if these amendments are voted down the Members should still vote for my amendment. I am trying to perform by my amendment an operation with a surgeon's knife rather than with a meat ax. The purpose of the Farm Security Administration is not to pile up six and a half million dollars in travel expenses. Most of their work in my State is commendable. The travel account budget for this year is a half-million dollars more than for the year 1941, yet the farmers today are better off than they were in 1941.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, after the dust settles it will appear that a lot of people have been talking about something about which they know little and concerning others than the amendment before us.

We are not proposing to take one cent away from that class to which weeping reference has been made. We are trying to limit a lot of things that ought to help these very people and ought to be limited.

This takes off the road a lot of people who ought to be at work on the farms. It is an attempt to put a stop to unjustified, wasteful expenditure of the taxpayers' money uselessly. That is the truth. Let us curtail where we can without hurting anybody, and to help a lot of people, and stop fighting windmills. Nobody is fooled who has read the hearings, which, obviously, too few have done and as evidenced by their discussion of the question before us just now.

My position with respect to the matter, discussing it generally, yet reducing it to the reason why this amendment should be adopted is found in what I have said before in the committee and on the floor, namely:

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

I am not so overwhelmed with the forest that I cannot see the trees, nor see "through a hole in a ladder." I see something in the Farm Security Administration payment of poll taxes to allow a person to vote which might, if carried to its ultimate, wreck the country. I am against it. It is playing politics in a most corruptible manner to attempt to link voting requirements with agricultural programs sponsored by the Government. It is not funny, smart, nor to be minimized, so far as its possibilities for the corruption of the electorate and the destruction of orderly government are involved.

I agree wholeheartedly with the editorial writer of the Washington Star, who said:

"Like so many other developments in Washington, the controversy as to whether the Farm Security Administration should make loans for the payment of poll taxes is sig-

nificant chiefly as a symptom of a state of mind."

Last Tuesday the President said he disapproved the use of Farm Security Administration funds to pay poll taxes. I agree. On Friday he changed this statement, declaring the premise on which his original statement was based had been erroneously presented. The Farm Security Administration plan, he said, consists of a household budget loan which includes funds for paying poll taxes.

Thus the President made a distinction. He would disapprove direct payment of poll taxes with Farm Security Administration funds; he does not disapprove the lending of these funds for payment of poll taxes along with a variety of household items.

This looks suspiciously like a distinction without a difference, especially in view of the fact that some 20 percent of Farm Security Administration loans are reported to be in arrears. It is one thing to lend impoverished farmers public funds for seed, stock, equipment, and similar purposes, but it is quite a different matter to use money paid in taxes by one citizen to enable some other citizen to pay his poll tax and vote, even though it be assumed that there is not the slightest intention to influence the political preference of the recipient of the loan.

To the President, who says he has always been opposed to poll taxes anyhow (why?), there may be a pronounced and obvious difference between the direct and indirect use of public funds to pay these levies. But it is a distinction which will not be so readily apparent to the taxpayers, who must foot the bill for the type of governmental activity of which this is a sample.

We can well afford to forget social gains just now. We cannot go on as usual. We will be lucky to limp along until we can walk.

So, as Congress realizes, and as the people must now more than ever, it is true that there is not a day, not an hour, to be lost. It is no exaggeration to say that our one real hope of victory lies in convincing the complacent American that he must plunge into the fight on the home front with everything that he has—not tomorrow or next week, but today.

Let us strip all these discussions of those nonessentials and obscurities to which the President has referred facetiously. The amendment is justified. It should be adopted, and a lot of people would vote for it if they would read the hearings before they follow off hog wild somebody less informed than they are themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to prolong this debate unduly but merely wish to remind the Members of Congress that in dealing with this particular item Members are dealing with some of the poorest people on earth. You are dealing here with landless and impoverished little farmers who are unable to help themselves.

Let me ask that Members bear in mind that 768,000 actual dirt farmers have been rehabilitated under the provisions of this act and despite the castigation that the Farm Security Administration has received here this week from some Members of Congress, let me remind Members that an overwhelming majority of those farmers have made good, have been able to remain on the farm, and improve by a marked degree their financial condition. Despite the ridicule, sarcasm, and unfair and extremely complimentary remarks that have been made

in and out of Congress, the splendid record of that organization with reference to this important item speaks for itself.

Mr. Chairman, it is one thing to stand up here and talk facetiously and even sarcastically about the Farm Security Administration, comparing it to rural fan dancing, but it is entirely another thing to know that should the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois prevail it will react against thousands of honest, hard-working citizens who through no fault of their own will be forced from the farms of the country. This particular item, let me say, has been cut drastically, first by the Budget and later by the committee. I want to make it plain that I do not wish this Congress to appropriate \$1 more than is absolutely essential, but I do feel that the committee has gone pretty far in reducing this item and that it would be poor economy to pass the pending amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the gentleman from Oklahoma say that the farmers were in bad shape but today they are making good. That is what some of us thought.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the items referred to by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee yesterday, Mr. CANNON, as being in the category that could be drastically curtailed without actually hurting the farmer. This has to do with administrative expenses, it has to do with travel and supervisors. It takes the supervisors off the road and turns them loose for constructive, useful, needed war work.

Mr. Chairman, it has gotten to the point when the F. S. A. in some localities have to advertise to get people to come and take this money. I have here an advertisement from the Cass Lake Times of Walker, Minn., as follows:

Money for farmers.

This by Erland Johnson, F. S. A. office, Walker, Minn.

I have another letter by a county agent, on the stationery of the Department of Agriculture, dated January 12, 1942. Listen to this:

The Federal Government has made available to farmers in Crawford County, a sum of money ranging from \$45 to \$75 per family. There are no strings or any obligations whatever to the money. It is a free gift to be used for purchasing the necessities of farm families.

January 17 will be the last day to make application so see one of the following and get an application blank, fill out and file before January 17, 1942.

It then shows the places where application blanks may be secured, and there is attached an application for rehabilitation, United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration.

Mr. Chairman, let us cut these things where they can be cut and curtail these administrative expenses and, as the gentleman from Missouri said, keep in the

bill those things that have been kept there which affect the price of the farmer's product and his market, things that really mean something.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, this is a delicate surgical operation and no place for a butcher's meat ax. I was in favor of cutting out all of the appropriation for borrowing money at this time to lend to farm tenants, who are the cream of each community. Did you ever try to settle a tenant on a farm and make a landowner of him? I have. The very best man in the community is the selected tenant. He can get his money anywhere. He gets Government money because it costs only 3 percent and the Government conditions are right. I would have cut out all of that \$45,000,000 had a few more of you voted with me.

This is another matter, however. This money is for the downtrodden, who must assert that they cannot get money or credit anywhere else. Such an applicant cannot go to the Crop Production Board, he cannot go to the banks, he cannot go anywhere and get financial help. There are three-quarters of a million of such people. Here is where the money ought to be left in this bill. We should not go in here with a meat ax and chop this off. You would destroy the hope and opportunity for hundreds and thousands who cannot get help elsewhere.

Our chairman of the Agricultural Committee does not understand the migratory labor camps of the West or he would not have offered his amendment; I know him too well. Our migratory camps have been a great success. They are an absolute necessity. It would be entirely unfair to compel any State to maintain these camps for people moving between the States for seasonal labor. We have had good administration of camps in the Northwest.

The F. S. A. loans in Oregon are important because we have many small farmers in irrigation districts which cannot come under the Farm Credit Administration. The total in our States is \$6,894,599, lent to 5,753 borrowers. Collections to date are 86.4 percent of maturities and will improve as agricultural prices are stabilized. One thousand seven hundred and thirty-five are entirely paid up, to the amount of \$3,512,984. In Malheur County, an irrigated section in my district, the F. S. A. has been a lifesaver and its clients have come from the four corners of this country. There have been 826 loans totaling \$874,260. Collections on the principal, so far, have been \$402,028.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this cut.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, first, to win this war we want production not only in industry but on the farm lands.

You are not going to get production on the farms unless you have farmers produce. That is No. 1.

Second, the people this bill is designed to help cannot get a dime from a bank. As you know, the banks have been hamstrung by the Federal Government until they cannot make a loan upon anything that is not liquid, that they cannot put on the market and get the money out of. These poor people cannot go any place else except to you, to the Congress, for relief. In the name of economy, are you going to deny these people, the poor people of my State and of every State in the Union, a chance to make a living? That is what we would be doing to adopt this amendment. Now, unless we rehabilitate them and give them something to work with, we will have to feed them anyhow. We have not reached a point yet where people will starve in this country. I might add their repayment record is good in my State.

Let us not reach the point where we put the dollar above humanity. That is the question. I say to my distinguished friend from Virginia, whom we all love and respect and admire for his great ability and economy stand, that his views on this amendment are contrary to the best interests of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, in the short time I have I cannot say very much, but certainly I want to agree with the last two speakers that this is not the place to take it out on the poorest of the poor farmers, the poor fellows who are down there trying not only to make a living but to save their homes and gain self-respect for themselves and their families.

We talk about travel expense. Maybe it is too much, I do not know, but I am sure that every department in our Government, from the largest to the smallest, could cut out a lot of travel expense. Yet you are dealing with a different class of people here. The majority of these are county supervisors and do not travel in Pullman cars. They travel on dirt roads, in snow banks, and in mud—that is where most of these distressed farmers live. That is where they travel, and that is where they have to go to serve these needy farmers; that is the kind of people they have to see. They have to inspect the farms to see whether or not they can make a loan. They have to see that these loans are repaid, and assist these people and advise them, ask them to keep books and see that the books are kept, and put these farmers on a business basis. Ninety-nine percent of them have made good. They had lost all opportunity; they had even lost all hope that they would ever be self-respecting again, and now they have regained that hope. Do not take it away from them. Leave them there and assist others to do likewise. These farmers are the finest examples of Americanism. They set an example to others to adopt better business methods.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that these field workers are the lowest-paid Government workers?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Most of them are working for from \$1,400 to \$1,800. They do not even get enough mileage allowance to pay their actual travel expense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the committee in writing this bill made due and appropriate cuts and economies such as the war demands. I am leaving it to their discrimination. I favor economy, too, where it can properly be made, but not at this point touching the poorest farm families.

I come from a State which lies on the highways of this country, across which came many refugees from the Dust Bowl seeking new homes farther west. I know that the Farm Security Administration has more than paid for itself in taking care of those refugees, the very poorest of our migratory farm population. Three useful migratory farm labor camps have been provided in Arizona which have been havens of refuge for many hundreds of these migratory families who had not where to lay their heads. Several worthy projects of a more permanent kind have salvaged much of human value among the destitute migratory farm class and restored self-respect and new hope to hundreds of families who were down and out, and in the very depths of despair.

Do not hamper this still very necessary program, for I tell you the war condition of today has not put an end to the situation that confronted us during the depression and which caused this distress. We must continue even during this war period to look after these families as the circumstances may require. I am not in favor of carrying on good Samaritan work only when remedial measures should be carried on. But if we cannot remedy an evil situation at its source, as we ought to do as statesmen, then let us not foreclose the good Samaritan work to alleviate some of the effects of that evil. Caring for the poor must be continued until we remedy the poverty which exists among our farm population. I prefer to prevent farm poverty rather than to apply charity in treating it, but to continue both so long as the need exists.

I am opposed to the Dirksen amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HOOK. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. Is there not a rule that a person cannot talk twice on the same amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. A gentleman can talk in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOOK. Is one Member allowed to talk twice on the same amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is talking on the pro forma amendment, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order in addressing the House twice on one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just ruled on that point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Illinois knows quite well what is in this bill and how this \$50,000,000 will be expended.

Mr. HOOK. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. As I understand it, the gentleman is speaking to the pro forma amendment, which is the last word, and I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to that pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not spoken yet.

Mr. HOOK. Evidently he has.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Illinois knows what is in this bill and he does not have to sustain his case by referring to anybody as a boulevard farmer. The justification is before me. There is in this proposal \$7,000,000 for mileage, roughly. There are salaries for more than 7,000 people who are going to visit throughout the country.

Mr. HOOK. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman is not proceeding to talk on the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the pro forma amendment?

Mr. HOOK. Striking out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the last word? The point is overruled.

Mr. HOOK. The last word is "binding."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is \$18,500,000 to maintain 2,252 county offices and 273 area offices; for the payment of 2,755 fine ladies to go out and see the farm homes in the country and for the payment of 4,327 county farm supervisors, when we have 7,000 doing the identical kind of work under the Extension Service for which we appropriate in this same bill.

I read from the justification that there is \$12,400,000 for servicing loans and grants. That is something for personnel.

There is \$1,750,000 for debt adjustment, and that is for personnel.

There is \$9,800,000 for grants, and if the amendment is adopted there will still be money enough for grants and personal services.

There is \$2,700,000 to maintain the migratory camps of which the gentleman from South Carolina, Judge FULMER, talked just a moment ago, and only a small amount for construction. It includes \$149,000 in mileage for those who are supervising the migrant camps in the bill. That is what is pending now.

The chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] stood on the floor here yesterday and said this was a cut by which we could make some saving and some economy. He has been the chairman of this subcommittee for years, he lives on a farm, he knows the farm problems, and you do not have to have any authority from me. You can take it from him as to whether or not we can safely cut \$25,000,000 out of this bill at the present time in the interest of the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to say anything more. I think the whole case has been made, and I reiterate to you that for the most part this is money for personal services plus \$9,000,000 for grants, but when the amendment is adopted they can still function and still have on the pay roll a number of employees that would make up a triangular division in the United States Army.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, for the remainder of the time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, there are so many angles to this question that it will be impossible for me to make reference to all of them in the brief time I shall have to discuss the matter. I do wish to point out this fact, since so much has been said in an effort to stress the opposition of the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and in doing so, I do it without any sort of reflection upon him. But, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee did not attend the hearings of the subcommittee in regard to the Farm Security Administration. He was present during our hearings, as I recollect, only during the evidence of Mr. Secretary Wickard, and the evidence of the Farm Bureau Organization. Mr. CANNON did not help to write this bill. If he entertains the opinion that this appropriation ought to have been cut more drastically than the committee cut it, he should have come into the committee, being a member of the subcommittee, in my judgment, and have offered his amendment in the committee. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did not offer in the subcommittee an amendment to cut the amount of this appropriation half in two. He did not offer such an amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. While I appreciate the reference of the gentleman from Georgia, it should be remembered that during the time to which the gentleman refers I was engaged in hearings on defense bills, but had conducted the hearings on the agricultural appropriation bill for many years and this year read in full the printed report of the hearings and also had the advantage of the hearings of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on this item. If there has been any error in my statements on the subject they should be pointed out.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. I said that I

attach no blame to the chairman of the committee for not being present and attending the hearings, but since the chairman of the full committee, because of other duties, was prevented from attending and participating in the activities of the subcommittee, I doubt whether he is justified in assuming that the House ought to rely on his judgment as to what the necessary requirements of this organization may be, rather than upon the judgment of gentlemen who did attend all of the hearings, and heard all of the evidence, and undertook to prepare here a bill that ought to be approved, in their judgment, by the House.

With regard to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum], the great economist, he is in possession, so he claims, of newspaper clippings and magazine clippings which show evidence of misfeasance on the part of employees of the Farm Security Administration. The gentleman from Virginia, while not a member of the subcommittee, is a member of the full committee. He must have been advised for the last 2 or 3 months that we have been holding sessions during the forenoons and afternoons, and during a large portion of that time investigating the affairs of the Farm Security Administration, trying to find out in what way we might be able to improve the work of that organization. A great deal of the time he has been sitting just across one room from us, and yet he did not come before our committee to advise us of evidence which he claims to have, concerning the alleged misfeasance on the part of employees of the Farm Security Administration.

I wonder whether the House, since the gentleman did not take that course, is now justified in reversing the judgment of the subcommittee on the basis of newspaper and magazine evidence, which he now produces on the floor of the House? They tell me that when Adolf Schickelgruber, alias Hitler, takes over a country in Europe the first thing he does is to send in his agricultural experts and scientists to organize the agriculture of that country and increase its production to the full limit of capacity. We do not like Adolf Hitler, and perhaps we want to do the opposite of what he does. We want, it seems, according to the views of some gentlemen here, instead of increasing our agricultural production to meet this war emergency, as is advocated by practically all authorities of the Department of Agriculture, to destroy part of the organization we have.

We want to take away from these seven hundred-odd thousand farmers in the country who have been producing increased amounts of agricultural products, the opportunity that they have had heretofore to produce, and we want to constrict and restrict production rather than increase it, as advocated by our national defense authorities, and by the authorities of the Department of Agriculture. That may be the way to win the war, or is it? That is the question for you to determine here. This has a very vital part in the national defense program. The evidence before our committee shows, without contradiction,

that if there is to be any increase in the amount of production of foodstuffs and other agricultural materials, that are regarded as strategic materials in the defense effort, it must come from the lower 50 percent of farmers of the United States. The upper 50 percent are already producing to the extent of their capacity. If there is to be increase in the production of food and other materials that are necessary, these poor fellows with whose efforts you are dealing today in approving or disapproving the amounts of the appropriations recommended by the subcommittee, must bring about that increase in production.

A great deal of misinformation has been given to the House. I wish it were possible in the time that I have to correct it all. That is a matter of impossibility. Men have been talking here about \$40,000,000 and \$33,000,000 administrative expenses just as if they knew what they were speaking of.

I hold here a copy of the Budget for 1943, page 464. The administrative expense connected with this particular item in the portion of the work of the Farm Security Administration is slightly in excess of \$6,000,000. There is also included in this item of \$50,000,000 that you propose to cut by this amendment to \$25,000,000, an item of approximately \$10,000,000 for grants. Is that something that ought to be cut out?

The gentleman from Illinois said they will not cut that out; that they will cut out some of these farm supervisors who are traveling around the country; that they are the itinerants. How do you know they are not going to cut out the \$10,000,000 in grants if you adopt this amendment? It is my observation of the departments of the Government that when they have to make reductions they reduce everything else before they reduce personnel. This grant of \$10,000,000 is very small. That permanent appropriation under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act carries \$132,000,000, of which \$89,000,000 is going to be used for the food-stamp plan. The chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], opposes that. I have always favored it, and I favor it now, but if we provide \$89,000,000 for grants to those suffering, underfed, undernourished citizens of our cities, are we not justified in providing \$10,000,000 in grants for the poor farmers of the country—

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry. I do not have time to yield.

To the poor farmers of the country who are producing foodstuffs that are being distributed in this way to the suffering and needy of our large cities.

In my judgment, there ought not be anybody in this country hungry, whether in the cities or on the farms, so long as we have surpluses of foodstuffs with which we should be able to feed them.

I could go through this list and show to you that the items which we provide for in this \$50,000,000 are absolutely necessary. We have cut many of these items. We have already cut this appropriation below the present fiscal year by \$60,000,-

000. I am referring now also to the loan item which is to follow this, in the amount of \$70,000,000. They had \$120,000,000 this year for that item, and this particular item is reduced \$10,000,000 under the appropriation for the present fiscal year. The total reduction, as I have said, below the amount available for this fiscal year is \$60,000,000.

In the name of common sense, what do you want to do with this organization? If you want to destroy it, then adopt an amendment to strike the appropriation for it out of the bill, but if you want to carry it on in a reasonable way, effecting such economies as may be possible, then certainly you cannot go any further than the subcommittee has undertaken to go in the preparation of this bill.

We have investigated the Farm Security Administration. We have gone through its work. We discovered a great deal more than the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] has been able to call to your attention. We have taken steps in the next paragraph of this bill to correct some practices which in our judgment were unfortunate. At the same time I say to you that it is distinctly unfair to undertake to condemn the Farm Security Administration, which has actually done a great deal of excellent work, simply because some farm supervisor published an ad in the paper which was not in accord with the instructions given from the Washington office, and which was done on his own initiative, and which perhaps constituted misfeasance on his part. We ought not to condemn an organization which has accomplished the amount of useful work which has been done by the Farm Security Administration simply because out of 18,000 or 19,000 employees some few may have been guilty of exercising bad judgment.

Gentlemen, this is a poor man's bill. You can vote to strike it out, because they say that in many cases the beneficiaries of this appropriation are not able to vote. You can make a record for economy if you want to in connection with the poor man's items in the bill, and after some of you have voted for extravagant appropriations for other purposes and who are now opposing reasonable appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, you can go back to the people and say, "Why, of course, I voted to appropriate money to build a huge building down on Pennsylvania Avenue to house the Office of Government Reports, a probably unnecessary organization. I voted for all extravagances which have been shown in the course of the progress of the defense program, but let me tell you something, when we got down to the poor farmer who could not get along without public assistance, we cut him down. We economized on him, and although he had already been cut \$60,000,000, we decided we would cut what was left of him in two."

Talk about these migratory labor camps, there is not one in my district or in my section of the country, but I am told by these people out West that they are very necessary things and are doing very useful work. This very Congress has appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Tolan committee to investi-

gate the conditions of these migratory laborers.

We sought to find out what to do about that.

And what does the Tolan committee say to do about it? They came before our subcommittee, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Tolan committee, and urged us not to do anything to cut down this Farm Security Administration, pointing out how necessary it was in the work of trying to undertake to do something for these migratory workers. Why do you want the Tolan committee to investigate anything if you are not going to take their advice when they bring in recommendations?

I am told by the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis]—

Mr. TABER. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. I make the point of order that time for debate on this paragraph has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair informs the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Georgia has three-fourths of a minute remaining.

The gentleman from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am informed by the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] that the removal of these Japanese laborers from the west coast agricultural areas has left the owners of those lands without labor for cultivation of their fields. That will add greatly to the necessity for these migratory labor camps to take care of the situation so far as those agricultural producers are concerned. You Members from the west coast know whether we should delete funds from this item; you know whether we should vote to cut out of this bill all appropriations for migratory labor. You also ought to know generally something about the work which has been done by this Administration in the adjustment of farm debts. They have cut down the debts of these people from about \$500,000,000 to approximately \$118,000,000. I hope you will not vote to cut out that part of the bill that is responsible for such a desirable achievement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 118, noes 106.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 142, noes 119.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to this paragraph?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. Was time limited to debate on the amendment just voted on, or to the paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The time limit was to the paragraph.

The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 83, in lines 1 and 2, strike out the language "And (6) projects involving construction and operation of migratory labor camps."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will this amendment, if carried, result in a further cut than that effected by the Dirksen amendment?

Mr. FULMER. It will save more.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry; but the amendment does not cut any money out of the bill.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULMER and Mr. VOORHIS of California) there were—ayes 99, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to this paragraph? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 83, line 16:

"In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

One of the most revolting things that has come to my attention since I have been a Member of Congress was the fact that Edward O'Neal, head of the Farm Bureau Federation, sat in the gallery yesterday afternoon signaling and directing the efforts of those on the floor of the House to sabotage one of the finest Government agencies that this Government has had in the interest of the small farmer and the war program. I say this advisedly because I saw it with my own eyes, and I refer to many others, including my good friend JED JOHNSON of Oklahoma, who observed the same tactics.

If I had any criticism to make on the Democratic side, I would say that it is lack of organization and lack of united will to save those things that we the

Democrats have fought for in the years past.

Those who are fighting to tear down this agency are the very group who cried out against the fortification of Guam, letting the island of Guam wide open for attack from the Japanese peril. They are now stripping from the farm program those fortifications necessary to stop the onrush of paganism, nazism, and fascism. The mistake was made in not fortifying Guam. The results are well known. The farm program, and especially the Farm Security Administration under the loan and rehabilitation program and the Farm Tenant Act, is just as important as the fortification of Guam would have been. We need food for freedom; we need food for our boys at the front; we need food for those at home—food to keep the morale of the people to the point that they be a support to the boys at the front. A rifle in the hands of a starving man is not effective against the onrush of a fanatical enemy.

I heard the voices raised here yesterday afternoon pleading falsely, in my opinion, with regard to the boys that are fighting and dying in the battles in the Far East. Even though we win this war, it will have been of no avail unless we win the peace. We who were in the last war realized the tragedy of the situation when we returned. Having won the war, we came back to a Nation that had lost its democratic spirit—lost the new freedom of President Wilson and the liberalism of Gladstone and Asquith. Both of these perished in the last war. Yet these forces that tore down democracy at that time are out now to destroy those things that will preserve democracy for those boys who will return after having offered their lives in the interest of democracy. True to the character of all wars, the present war placed into the hands of the Tory minority increased powers of obstruction. Ever since America was required to go all-out for arms production this selfish group could command a high price for its cooperation. Several years ago President Roosevelt paid the price that was demanded and that was the control of the defense program and the sacrifice of the most militant men who have fought in the interest of a real democracy for America. From that time on, this group has fought every single solitary thing that was built to bring about a better way of life. The Bureau of the Budget rose suddenly first to smear and then to break down all gains that were made in the past. The Byrd committee, led by the junior Senator from Virginia, under the guise of the Citizens Emergency Committee, has carried on their work of destruction. Today this group clamors for further cuts as war expenditures rise and the peril of inflation threatens us. They were the ones that fought price control, rationing, and adequate income corporate taxes, but they are the ones now that demand that inflation be halted by slashing appropriations for agencies that are necessary to the war program. The Citizens Emergency Committee, the Farm Bureau Federation is nothing more than the new front of the National Association of Manufacturers

and the Republican National Committee hired to do their dirty work at a time when it is considered bad manners to indulge in politics.

You of the Democratic Party, if you are true to your convictions that this war should be won in the interest of democracy, should preserve democracy for those people who are fighting and dying on the battlefields, do not tear down the flag of democracy today by wiping out the only organization that can bring about an increased production of food in this fight for freedom. The eyes of those boys will be turned upon you. The blood and the sweat and the tears will have been shed in vain if we do not preserve that for which we are fighting. Rise up, you Democrats, and beat down this onrush that is about to tear this Congress asunder as they did after the last war. If you do not, there will be a full Republican Congress here, and then God help the democratic gains we have made in the past.

The young men on the front lines facing death from the air, on the ground, and on the sea are the generation to whom the future belongs. They are fighting for the right to live in a country that will or should be governed by the democratic or American way of life. We, here in this Congress, alone can bring that future about, or we can by the action of the Republican reactionary minority destroy that thing for which they are fighting.

This farm-security program is one in which Franklin D. Roosevelt, the beloved President of the United States, has taken much pride in, because it is the one program that has reached the forgotten man. That is why the Republicans and the reactionary group referred by me heretofore in this speech has, through the slashing of appropriations, attempted to destroy it.

You cannot destroy the will of the people. You Republicans may take great pride here today sabotaging the program which has helped the farmer, but you cannot destroy their will to live in decency.

You Democrats must or should realize that the strategy of the Republicans is to play politics by voting for direct appropriations for the Army and Navy, but against all other expenditures. That will give them an opportunity to say at election time, "We were for all-out defense but against nonessential expenditures." The American public is not dumb. The people know what happened before Pearl Harbor and will judge the Republicans' actions in these instances just as short-sighted as before Pearl Harbor.

When food shortages appear; when ration cards are the order of the day, I want the farmer, the laborer, and the housewife to know that they were brought about by the Republican reactionaries, coupled with the Byrd group representing the citizens' reactionary committee and the National Association of Manufacturers. Oh, yes; do not forget the Republican National Committee which is using these groups to put over the thing that they have not the nerve to sponsor in their own name.

Let me sum this up by referring to the past and its analogy to the present together with what is in the offing in the

immediate future if the Democrats do not wake up to what is going on.

In the last term of President Wilson this same group misled the people and elected a Republican House. They then proceeded to wreck the Wilson program. This resulted in the Hoover depression. God forbid that we ever go through another.

Wilson was not able to carry out the peace program as it should have been. Thus the world conflict of today. The Republicans were responsible for that because when President Wilson sailed to Europe to take part in the Versailles affair for the peace of the world, a Republican House had been elected just 5 weeks before. This led Theodore Roosevelt to remark:

Our allies, our enemies, and Mr. Wilson himself must know that Mr. Wilson has no authority to speak for the American people at this time. His leadership has just been emphatically repudiated by them.

So, my friends, you see the Republican gang and the reactionary group do not want to see President Roosevelt in a position to speak in the interest of a lasting peace. If a Republican House is elected it would be a repudiation of President Roosevelt and take from him the authority to speak for America. Oh, how the Japs, Nazis, and Fascists would welcome that. I plead with you in the name of humanity, in the name of the American people who want a lasting peace, do not follow the kind of leadership that has shown its fangs on the floor of this House today and yesterday; and, oh yes, in the gallery. Follow the safe, sane road that is the leadership of President Roosevelt. Give him our support and we will be safe. Fail him in this hour of need and you will relegate the future generations to wars, blood, sweat, and tears. Yes, worse than concentration camps, in my opinion, into the bonds of serfdom.

Wake up, you Democrats, before it is too late.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook]?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, if it is only 1 minute let him go ahead. We can stand another minute.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close. I understand there are no other bona fide amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Tarver]?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary of Agriculture, upon his request, in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$70,000,000. Such advances shall be

made: (1) With interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary of Agriculture shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, line 8, strike out "\$70,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the fiscal year 1942 the Farm Security Administration had available \$120,000,000 in R. F. C. loans for rural rehabilitation purposes. The Budget reduced the estimate to \$75,000,000 for 1943 and the committee subsequently reduced that figure to \$70,000,000.

The amendment now pending proposes to reduce this from \$70,000,000 to \$50,000,000.

If I need any argument to support this amendment I find it in the bill. On page 85 you will notice beginning in line 4 this limitation:

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption shall be used (1) for the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land purchase program.

You may wonder how this limitation got into the bill. The limitation was suggested by that very courageous and diligent public servant, the Chairman of this subcommittee, Mr. TARVER, who is just as familiar with the abuses that have been happening in the field of rehabilitation loans as any other member of the subcommittee.

The record will show that the F. S. A. has created 18 separate corporations in 18 separate States made up of employees of the Farm Security Administration and to whom farm security funds were lent for the purpose of purchasing large tracts on which to house farm families. You will find it on page 304 of volume 2 of the hearings. Actually they have under purchase 372,300 acres, totaling \$11,946,000. They estimate the development cost of that land to be another \$11,000,000. So that the entire outlay for 3,542 families will be \$23,000,000. Those are the people whose farms have been possessed by the Government where they have located a defense project. There is no indication that the element of need has entered into the use of that money, yet they have set up separate corporations of their own employees and they

propose to spend \$23,000,000 for this purpose if they can find money for the purpose, and the element of need does not enter into it.

They can stand a cut of \$20,000,000 and for that matter a good deal more. They have been relocating these families and the cost will run up as high as \$11,000 per family.

When they created the Iowa Defense Corporation they took over with one of these corporations created by the F. S. A. 10,100 acres of land for 125 families. The relocation costs will be \$11,080 per family.

Let us see what other agencies have been relocating farmers. Take, for instance, the Tennessee Valley Authority. Down in the Cherokee area they relocated 793 families at a cost of \$18.76 per family. The Farm Security will spend an average of \$7,000 and up to over \$11,000 for that purpose.

In the Wolf Creek Ordnance District at Milan, Tenn., the Tennessee Valley Authority relocated 525 families at a cost of \$6.21 per family. In the Watts Bar area they relocated 890 families at a cost of \$18.19 per family. The Farm Security Administration will do it at a cost of at least \$7,000, or more. That is one limitation we wrote into the bill at the insistence of our good friend Judge TARVER.

The second limitation we wrote in on page 85 is that the money shall not be available for carrying on experiments in collective farming. Collectivism is going on at the present time. It seems to have the favor of some of those who are giving direction to the policies of the F. S. A.

Finally, the third limitation written in by the subcommittee provides that not over \$2,500 of this money shall be loaned to any individual farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman feel that that \$2,500 should be reduced to about \$1,000, in view of the fact that they are not going to buy any land?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would favor such a reduction, but I do believe that in view of the fact that regardless of need they go around and use this money to relocate families we can safely cut at least \$20,000,000 from the loan fund and not in any wise injure the present program.

Mr. COOLEY. I call attention to the fact that the Comptroller General held that they had no authority to do that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. That ought to be stressed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to understand clearly this provision and the effect of the proposed amendment. I have no quarrel with anybody for voting his convictions after he understands the issue which is involved, but I do think we ought to try to understand just what has been done by the committee and what is here involved.

I have already pointed out on more than one occasion that our subcommittee has been responsible for finding out most

of these facts about the handling of the affairs of the Farm Security Administration about which gentlemen complain. They can read our hearings and find the material which we developed as to practices which we thought were improper.

I took the position, as you will observe from the hearings, in examining Mr. Baldwin that his use of money for the purpose of buying these large tracts of land upon which to locate people removed from defense areas was a misuse of these funds. It was upon my suggestion that the question was submitted to the Comptroller General. The Department did not submit the question to the Comptroller General until after the committee had indicated that it proposed to do so. So we put in the bill in line with the ruling of the Comptroller General—in fact, we put it in the bill before he made his ruling—this limitation on page 85 which will not permit them to use any of this money to buy land at all.

I may say this in justice to the people who are running the Farm Security Administration. This land-purchase program for the taking care of families removed from defense areas did not originate with them. They were told to do it. It may be that some method of taking care of these people who are removed from the defense areas ought to be adopted. I think there should be a method adopted. But I do not think we should go to the extent of buying a \$7,500 farm for every farmer who is removed from such areas. I think it might be much more reasonably accomplished than with that sum of money, and I do not think it is an obligation of the Department of Agriculture. I think that whenever the defense activities of the country dislocate a part of the farm population, any necessary expense in relocating them ought to be taken care of as a national defense item and ought not to be included in a bill for the Department of Agriculture. That is one thing.

Now, these Resettlement Administration projects which have been carried on in some cases on a cooperative basis, which, to my mind, is rather communistic in nature, were not started by the Farm Security Administration. They were started by the old Resettlement Administration under the Department of the Interior—Mr. Tugwell, and his associates. They were inherited by the Farm Security Administration, who had directions from the Congress, reiterated in the pending bill, to liquidate those projects, wind them up, and get them out of the way. They cannot properly be held responsible for programs which were initiated in connection with those projects by the Resettlement Administration, but we do provide in the bill that they shall not use any of this money for carrying on any experiment in collective farming except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated. The committee has made that provision.

Then we decided that since these loans were for the benefit of distressed agriculture, and since they said they had over 600,000 applicants they were unable to take care of or do anything for, they ought not to be loaning as much as \$7,000 or \$7,500 to one individual—that they

ought to spread it out a little more and try to reach more folks. So we put this limitation in here that they cannot make loans to any individual in excess of \$2,500.

I wanted to make the amount \$1,000. I would vote to make the amount of that limitation \$1,000 now. I want to help the poorest fellow, and we have so many of them in agriculture that you could use all this money and not make a loan of more than \$1,000 to any one individual, but you would need all this money in order to do it. If you really want to correct some of the extravagances of the program, offer an amendment here to cut this amount of \$2,500 to \$1,000, so as to spread that out a little bit more.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. I have an amendment just along the line the gentleman is now discussing to cut that figure from \$2,500 to \$1,000. I agree with the gentleman that this program can do very much good, but I do not see the necessity of having loans as high as \$2,500.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. I think that would be a wise thing to do—to cut this limitation on loans from \$2,500 to \$1,000. They have been making loans in the amount of \$7,000 or \$7,500, which I think is totally beyond the intent and purpose of the Congress in making provision for this sort of work. The gentleman's amendment would cut the amount to \$50,000,000, although it has already been cut from \$120,000,000 to \$75,000,000 by the Budget and further to \$70,000,000 by the committee.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. How much was the amount spent last year?

Mr. TARVER. The amount spent last year was \$120,000,000 for loans. So we already have in this bill as it is written now \$50,000,000 below the amount to be spent for the present fiscal year.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I appreciate the suggestion made by the chairman to cut the amount to \$1,000. I recall the other day we limited to \$1,000 the amount any one person could receive under the soil-conservation program.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman. I think if you will read these hearings you will find that I have been as active as anybody could be in bringing about economies in this administration. I hope you are not going to destroy it. Any amendment which is of a constructive character and will tend to bring about greater efficiency in the work of the organization and have it reach more people and be of more benefit to the people of the country I shall support as well as you, but I hope,

in view of the drastic reductions already made, you will not undertake still further to reduce the funds available for this purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill has had a long and difficult journey through this House, in large part due to the fact that there is an economy wave spreading over the country in reference to the civil functions of the Government. It is based upon emotionalism rather than rationalism and is sure to result in reductions that are unwise and will be destructive of essential Government functions. Further because of the fact that some of the officers of the Farm Bureau organization of America, led by Mr. Ed O'Neal, its president, has decided that the farm program, as advanced by the administration and led by Claude Wickard, the Secretary of Agriculture, must die, or else it must pass into the hands of Mr. O'Neal and his associates, and then these same persons desire to transfer all matters dealing with field work to the Extension Service of the Agriculture Department. Some of this Extension Service is, in large part in some States, directly responsive to the will and desire of those Farm Bureau leaders who are so responsible for the fight here made against agriculture. That organization has actually, by Mr. O'Neal's own testimony a year ago in these hearings, asked Extension Service agents to go out and recruit membership for the Farm Bureau organization. This practice, in my humble judgment, is a dangerous practice and could make a private organization greater than Government itself.

Let us look at this item here. The hearings will disclose that the Farm Bureau was not particularly opposed to the F. S. A. activity as such, but they wanted it in the Extension Service where it could be made subservient to their own demands. This item last year was \$120,000,000. The committee cut it under Budget estimates \$5,000,000, making it \$70,000,000. Now what has this service done for the underprivileged farmer? This service has met the needs of thousands and hundreds of thousands of poor but good and honest American farm families, whose sons today by the thousands are in the armed forces and are going to be asked to, and will, willingly die, if need be, for this country. They are patriots and the sons of patriots.

Five hundred and sixty million dollars has been paid out in grants and loans to 738,000 farm families and they have already paid back \$200,000,000 of that money. The average crop value of families before they received this benefit per annum, was \$480. After receiving this service it was increased to \$640.

Last year the increased agricultural production of clients under Farm Security, getting their loans from this source, amounted to \$75,000,000. It is estimated that if it were carried on on the same price level this year as last, it would amount to \$80,000,000. Given the increased prices for farm products now

prevailing, this sum would be over \$100,000,000.

Their repayment figures indicate that this agency is successful financially, but above and beyond the \$70,000,000 we have 600,000 to 700,000 American families that are being put upon a higher level of living and alone are capable of meeting this increased demand for agricultural crops in this year.

Now some of the details of the program might not be all they ought to be, and they probably could be improved. The record shows this Agency has reached a high degree of efficiency.

In the States of Oregon and Washington I have gone over a number of these projects and I have talked to scores of these farmers who have been given consideration by this service. I have found them entirely a different type of men than they were before they secured this consideration and, mark you, this is not giving money, it is loaning money at 3½ percent. It is not taking money out of the Federal Treasury, because it is merely an authorization to borrow money from the R. F. C.

Now, if we want to say to an important and large number of our people, about 700,000 farm families, that we are going to continue to keep them in a depressed condition and that we will drive them further down into the pit of despair, then I say to you, my colleagues, you are creating a situation that so many of you state you fear. You are creating a condition that might destroy the economic order we have in America and destroy free enterprise. This matter involves more than dollars and cents. They involve more than the desire of some individual to elevate himself into a position of influence. They involve the life of our beloved country.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment ought to be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the original purpose of the farm-security program was to assist distressed farm people who could not get financial assistance elsewhere to get out of debt and become self-supporting. A gigantic bureaucracy has been built up which seeks to perpetuate its army of employees and to extend and maintain its control of clients. All too often poor farmers have been persuaded to incur debts beyond their ability to repay, or they have been saddled with excessive costs against their own judgment and desires, due to the impractical and extravagant plans which were forced upon them by F. S. A. representatives.

Clients complain bitterly of the practices and policies of the F. S. A. Among these complaints are the following:

1. Getting borrowers too heavily involved in debts beyond their ability to repay.

2. Payment of excessive prices for land and imposing extravagant, unnecessary improvements upon borrowers.

3. Excessive overhead costs of management in the case of cooperative farming projects, which must be paid for by borrowers.

4. Dictatorial methods of supervision of F. S. A. clients which destroys initiative and freedom and self-reliance of clients.

5. Impractical farm management methods which result in unnecessary costs to borrowers.

Examples of the foregoing complaints and conditions follow:

FROM MISSISSIPPI REPORT OF INVESTIGATOR
WILLIAM G. CARR

NO. 5. COSTS PLACED ON BORROWERS

I have already cited the case of the Loch Lomond plantation in Leflore County. This place was formerly owned by a Mr. Sibley. It was one of the show places of the State of Mississippi. It had 4 six-room houses, 1 seven-room house, 12 four-room houses, and 8 three-room houses. These houses were made out of the finest hard cypress. They had copper screen on the windows and doors. They were in excellent condition when the Farm Security Administration took over the property.

These houses were all torn down and the lumber, which is practically extinct today, was used for fuel. The people in general in this community feel it was nothing short of a crime to destroy these houses, which they say were built to last 100 years.

The erection of new buildings on this farm increased the financial load placed upon the clients and, bearing in mind the production figures which I have already given, it is practically impossible for them to ever pay off their notes.

Buildings were torn down on the Sunflower plantation in Sunflower County and new buildings were erected. Land was purchased at \$60 per acre. I was told that these unnecessary improvements have run the value of the land to as high as \$126 per acre. This burden, of course, is being carried by the clients.

There are numerous other incidents where smaller amounts are involved. Fruit jars are given to the clients. Very few of them are ever used. Draperies, curtains, etc., are put up for a short while and eventually thrown away.

A landlord by the name of Summers in Lincoln County had built a new barn just a few years before the Farm Security Administration acquired the property. The barn was giving adequate service, but it was torn down and a new one built.

There have been numerous complaints concerning the saddling of debts on clients by the actions of the clients themselves. I was told that in Lincoln County the Farm Security Administration clients make it a practice of getting their fertilizer and selling it on the way home for about one-third to one-half of its original cost. It was impossible to check on this in the short time which I had to make the investigation.

I favor the Dirksen amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative with a city constituency including a large portion of industrial workers, I rise to make certain observations and raise certain questions about the attacks on the Farm Security Administration. I do so in part because organized labor of all affiliations—A. F. of L., railroad brotherhoods, and C. I. O.—is actively defending the Farm Security program and asks that that program not only be maintained but expanded. Labor recognizes the major importance to be played in full production for the war by the army of low-income farmers of the country. Labor agrees with President Roosevelt's statement that these farmers are the very ones who can expand most readily under supervision of the Farm Security Administration and with credit advanced by that agency. Labor sees that any move made by this Congress to jeopardize increased food production by these farmers is a definite threat to the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

It is pertinent, therefore, to inquire from what source these attacks on the Farm Security Administration derive. They come, as all of us know, from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and certain of his associates. These men charge waste, incompetence and worse to the Farm Security Administration. By no means, however, do they speak for their entire national organization. The Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, one of the largest branches of the national organization, through its secretary, Murray Lincoln, and its president, Perry L. Green, has spoken vigorously in support of the Farm Security Administration and has disavowed Mr. O'Neal and his associates. So likewise have the Vermont Farm Bureau Federation and various other elements in the national organization. The National Farmers Union through its president, James G. Patton, and the chairman of its legislative committee, M. W. Thatcher, who is president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, has been and is unequivocal in its endorsement of the Farm Security program and is urging its expansion as a war measure.

Why, then, these attacks by Mr. O'Neal, using the Byrd economy committee and certain Members of this body as his spokesmen? Is it not fair to point out that Mr. O'Neal, together with certain of his associates, represents the large-plantation type of operation in the cotton South and the large-scale commercialized farming operations in the grain, vegetable, and fruit sections of the country? Is it not proper to suggest that Mr. O'Neal does not want any governmental agency to help restore tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers to ownership and operation of their own farms, and thus check the growth of the type of operations he represents? The farm security program is aimed toward the reinstitution of family type farming in this country as the backbone of our democratic system.

At the bottom of this barrage of loosely flung charges at the Farm Security Administration seems to me to be a fundamental clash between divergent eco-

nomic and social policies. The policy of Mr. O'Neal appears to be a kind of modern feudalism in concept, believing in the concentration of land ownership in a comparatively small proportion of the agricultural population. This concept makes tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers subject to industrialized agricultural management with ownership more often than not in absentee hands.

The Farm Security Administration obviously believes in doing everything it can to help reverse that trend and to make family farming the dominant, the significant factor it formerly was in our economy and in our social and political customs.

It is interesting to speculate on whether Mr. O'Neal, as president of a farm organization, has a further organizational vested interest in restricting the farm security efforts to help rehabilitate low-income farmers, tenants, sharecroppers, and farm laborers. In that connection I wish to refer to a letter or a telegram received the other day by Senator LA FOLLETTE, member of the Byrd economy committee, when Mr. O'Neal was first publicly airing his charges against the Farm Security Administration. This communication, I am informed, was from John A. Boutwell, chairman of the agriculture committee of the Mississippi House of Representatives and chairman of a special fact-finding committee of that body. Senator LA FOLLETTE read parts of that letter into the Byrd committee record. I believe the entire letter should be placed in the RECORD, since up to now it has had only partial public reference.

When Ed. O'Neal appeared before the Byrd committee he made the statement that he had "cracked down" on Wallace when he was Secretary, that he had "cracked down" on Wickard when he didn't do what he (O'Neal) thought he should, and that he would "crack down" on anyone who didn't do what he thought was right.

It is apparent that O'Neal is now "cracking down" on Congress.

My reasons for referring to the questions are twofold. First, I am convinced that continuation and expansion of the farm security program are essential for our war effort and for the long-range welfare of our country, with family-type farming as the predominant method in the agricultural areas. Secondly, growing out of that, I feel strongly that unmerited attacks on governmental agencies like the Farm Security Administration—whether those attacks spring from selfish, economic, or organizational motives—are a definite disservice to our country in its hour of great peril and should be revealed as such and discouraged wherever and whenever possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in dealing with a problem like this, it seems to me that the House, acting as a Committee of the Whole, finds itself handicapped. It is always difficult to write a bill on the floor. It is difficult to take the different types of loans that are made by an agency like F. S. A., and,

in a minute or two, draw the line between those that are more valuable than others. I am reminded of that by the opinions that have been expressed with regard to the size of the loan that might be permitted.

Last fall I took a day and visited clients of the Farm Security Administration in my district who had received rural rehabilitation loans. As a result, I was convinced that a small loan to a man in a livestock country was less likely to succeed than a loan somewhat larger—still not what you would call a big cattle loan. The man whose loan was too small had nothing with which to make a living while his herd was growing. Of course, anyone familiar with livestock financing knows that a loan of \$1,500 or \$2,000 may be a sounder loan than one of \$400 or \$500.

So I think it would be definitely a mistake to change the limitation on the size of the loan without thorough consideration of what is involved. Let me illustrate: I have in mind two clients; one started off in 1937 with a loan of \$435. It was not enough to buy enough livestock for him to get anywhere. He bought a few cows, but he had no income until he could get a second generation of calves. He had to have grants to live on. He required more loans for doctors' bills. After about 4 years his loan totals had doubled, but it was not until then that he had enough livestock that he could sell anything. In the fifth year, however, his inventory showed assets in excess of his liabilities.

On the other hand, another client started off with a loan of about \$2,300. He got a loan at the outset big enough to get a little dairy herd along with his beef foundation. In a year's time his assets showed an increase of \$1,700 over his liabilities.

This is a difficult problem to set forth in 3½ minutes, but any of you who have had any experience with livestock loans at banks must know that the average bank would prefer to loan a livestock man enough for a profitable operation than to make three or four smaller loans where the farmer would not have a decent chance to come out on them.

I think that the rural rehabilitation loans have been the soundest part of the Farm Security Administration program. These are not lifetime land-purchase loans; they are operating loans. They have taken people who were put out of business by drought and put them on their feet. They have taken people who could not get commercial credit and have helped them to get started again.

The collections on these loans are steadily increasing. Up to January 30 of this fiscal year, I am advised, collections amounted to \$63,000,000 as compared with \$38,000,000 in the preceding fiscal year for the same period. I sincerely hope that the House will distinguish between this and other propositions where money spent is gone forever. These are working loans for people who can produce but who cannot qualify for commercial credit. They are paying out.

This program is a sound proposition in producing food for victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, if you will pardon a personal allusion, I would like to first identify my expressed interest in legislation designed for the benefit of agriculture for the past 25 or 30 years.

I had the privilege and the honor of preparing and submitting to the committee the first plan, and the plan finally adopted, for allocating funds by the Federal Government to the various States when the law creating the Extension Service was first enacted. That was the real beginning of our modern agricultural program. It was my privilege to outline the first long-term amortization plan for loans to farmers in the United States, and the plan was used and became the basis of the Federal land bank system created by Congress in 1915.

Upon coming to Congress in 1925 it was my privilege to be the author of the law known as the Produce Agency Act, which makes it unlawful for a commission merchant to make a false report regarding the condition, disposition, or sale of any perishable farm crop received upon consignment. It was also my privilege to introduce the first bill in the Congress providing for direct loans to farmers for production purposes through the intermediate credit bank. It was my further privilege to be the author of the first bill introduced in this body to insure bank deposits. Previous bills had been introduced providing for the guaranty of such deposits, but the first bill to insure bank deposits was offered in 1931. This was during President Hoover's administration, and my Republican friends missed a good opportunity to have obtained credit for the enactment of one of the most valuable laws enacted by the Congress within the last quarter of a century, because it was left to the present administration to enlarge upon the proposal and enact it into law in 1934.

Mr. Chairman, I do not make these statements for the purpose of boasting or appearing to be egotistic, but I make them for the purpose of showing my long and active interest in behalf of agriculture.

I hold no brief for the Farm Security Administration, because that policy was adopted while I was not a Member of this body, but I want to say that from my observation and contact it has made and is still making valuable contribution in an effort to rehabilitate many farmers, particularly those who have been unable to find means by which they could carry on their business and remain on the farm. They may have made some mistakes. It would be a miracle if they have not, but the new language placed in the bill by the subcommittee should certainly correct them without destroying the many virtues in the program.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would strike \$20,000,000 from the "funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers," as provided in lines 4 and 5 on page 84 of the bill now under consideration. In my district and State the farmers had the most disastrous crop failure last year known in

history. An actual survey of 1,485 farmers in my home county shows that 10 percent of them harvested no cotton whatsoever, 36 percent of them produced less than one-half of a bale, and the average was only about 2 bales compared with the usual average of approximately 8 bales per farm.

The corn crop of many of them was equally as short. They had but little to do at harvest time and there was no opportunity otherwise for employment; as a consequence a large percentage of them were in actual need and distress. A bill I introduced on October 10 of last year to provide governmental assistance to these farmers was favorably reported with minor amendments by the Committee on Agriculture. Six or eight weeks ago when I stood here and argued for the passage of the bill we were met by opponents to the measure who said and argued that the Farm Security Administration had been established for the purpose and was able, ready, and willing to supply the needs of most of these farmers. The bill was defeated by that argument. Thousands of these farmers have filled application with their county Farm Security Administration agent, many of whom have been advised that up to this time their needs and wants could not be met with available funds. Now the Appropriations Committee has included in this bill an item authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation upon request of the Secretary of Agriculture to advance a limited amount of funds to be used by the Farm Security Administration for aiding and assisting such needy farmers, including others who may be in need or entitled to such assistance. The amendment referred to would reduce the amount by \$20,000,000 which is approximately the amount requested a few weeks ago in the bill referred to and I sincerely trust the amendment will not be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is a grand thing to stay in the Well of the House and enumerate the many, many things that we have done for the benefit of the farmer, the many things that we have done for the benefit of labor, and the many things we have done for the benefit of industry, but after all is said and done we have got to sum it up and find out whether the many laws that have been passed in the last few years are the best thing for this country of ours. We have the responsibility to see that this Nation is perpetuated under the Constitution and under the form of government that was handed to us when we came into office. We swore to uphold that Constitution and abide by it. But I think in the last 6 or 8 years we have got so far afield that when we take an inventory of all the things that have been done we find now where we are going. We have handed out money lavishly and extravagantly until we have the greatest debt the Nation has ever known. The fact that you increased the national debt limit last

week from \$65,000,000,000 to \$125,000,000,000 shows the position you are getting yourselves into. You are just about getting to the breaking point—to bankruptcy. We have been handing out things to the people of this country, making them believe they could get anything they wanted by asking the Federal Government or the New Deal for it or by asking their legislators for it; that it was just like getting manna from heaven or getting money out of a well that never went dry. But the fact is you have to go back to your taxpayers now and tell them they have to pay more taxes. You have got to pay for the things we gave the people, because we have raised our debt to the point where we cannot give it to them any longer without a financial wreck. You thought money grew on trees. You will find that it must come from the people in taxation if we are to survive the squandering of the past 8 years.

I want to help the people of our country, consistent with sound business judgment, and to the ability of our taxpayers to aid and assist.

I think the Santa Claus should get out of government, and that the Congress and the President should stop, look, listen, and be able to say no, when it means the welfare of our Nation.

How long are you going to be able to go on before you run into bankruptcy? Not very long. How long are you going to be able to continue these things and still be able to furnish the guns, the ships, the ammunition, and the airplanes necessary for men like MacArthur, who are working 24 hours a day and lying in the trenches with their very lives at stake? We do not want to interrupt the peaceful routine of good, sound-thinking, well-fed American citizens, but I must say you have about reached the breaking point of our ability to pay.

In the name of America, our liberty, our independence, our freedom, also to our boys in the trenches now at war, furnish them the tools to work with, the guns, ships, ammunition, airplanes, or you will lose the war, and wreck the Nation. Then all is lost. Vote some economy. Where will you get the money?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DUNCAN] for 3½ minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor of representing one of the finest agricultural districts in the Middle West, in northwest Missouri. I do not know anything about this organization generally; I know only how it has operated in my section of the country. It has done a splendid job. The administrators are capable, conscientious people. It has people who are absolutely unable to obtain loans elsewhere to stay on the farms or to get back on farms. I believe we will have to depend in the future more on small farmers than we have in the past. Already in our section of the country agricultural labor is becoming a very great problem. These smaller farmers must be encouraged. I am just a bit afraid that \$1,000 is too low a maximum, but it depends a good deal on the community, the type of agriculture in which

they are engaged as to how much is necessary. In an area where they are growing corn, wheat, and engaging in general farming I believe it would require a bit more to get them going than in some other area.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not true also that at the present price of livestock, high as it is, \$1,000 does not go very far toward stocking a farm?

Mr. DUNCAN. Very definitely so.

Mr. Chairman, in the remainder of my time I want to read a letter which came to me this morning. It speaks more forcefully than anything I can say. It comes from Gentry, Mo. Omitting the salutation, I read:

I understand there is in Congress a move to curtail or eliminate the activities of the Farm Security Administration. I urge you to use whatever influence you can to see that this is not done.

I have just completed my first year as a borrower and client of the Farm Security Administration, and if you could see and realize what it has done for me and my family you would never see its work curtailed or eliminated.

You, of course, are familiar with my case with the Veterans' Administration, and after I got to where I could become eligible for Farm Security Administration help it has meant everything to me and my wife and 7-year-old daughter in better living, a chance to be self-supporting, and to look toward the future with the confidence that with a reasonable chance we can get on our feet again.

Of course there are instances of mistakes made, but that's to be expected.

This Farm Security Administration help was the only way out we had except to go on direct relief, and I urge you to consider very carefully anything that would deprive myself and other farmers of this great administrative agency of help.

With best regards,

Respectfully,

J. B. SEAT.

There are thousands of cases like that, of men who have been kept off relief, who have become self-respecting and self-supporting citizens. I do not know just what the maximum loan should be. I do believe we should consider it well, having in mind the requirements and conditions of the different sections of the country, before limiting it to \$1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] for 3½ minutes.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, it is seldom that I rise in the Well of the House to discuss the various issues that are brought up from time to time. However, I feel this agricultural problem is very important and should be discussed and explained in as much detail as possible.

I am proud to say that I represent one of the finest agricultural districts in the country, the Fourth Congressional District, in the northeastern corner of Indiana. One of the important problems before the House today is the proposed farm-credit legislation. One of the objections that I have to the proposed legislation is the cost that will have to be borne by farmers and other agricultural groups. Control in Washington would replace the old, but proven, system of

cooperatives, or, rather, the cooperative system of farm loan banks.

We were told in the committee hearings on this legislation that lower interest rates might inflate land values and cause greater speculation and make it more difficult to pay for a farm; that many farm owners would be taxed to subsidize interest and losses of less successful farmers. The Federal land bank system would become a Government lending agency under Federal control. Naturally, if it were supported by public funds it would also expect to control it. Therefore I would like to see the land bank system controlled in their own communities.

I am sure this will be satisfactory to all concerned, because farmers are now getting parity income, and in all probability it will continue for some time to come. Farm-mortgage interest rates are the lowest in history. These banks have proved their soundness, that they need not be subsidized nor operated by Federal agencies.

Another matter I wish to bring to your attention at this time in our march for economy in governmental affairs is a proposal adopted by a group of patriotic farmers in Allen County, in my district, pledging themselves to refrain from accepting any more A. A. A. payments during the emergency; that they further pledge themselves to produce to the limit of their ability the crops they are equipped to produce. "We will stop the sayings that the farmers have to be paid to be patriotic."

Since Allen County was the first to begin this march of Government economy in food production and refraining from accepting any more A. A. A. payments during the emergency, 87 Adams County farmers, in my district, adopted a similar resolution, and I am informed other districts will follow shortly.

The Decatur Daily Democrat of March 9, 1942, has this to say:

[From the Decatur (Ind.) Daily Democrat of March 9, 1942]

FARMERS PLEDGE NOT TO RECEIVE PAYMENTS—REFUSE GOVERNMENT BENEFIT PAYMENTS

A group of Adams County farmers met at the Rainier School Friday evening. They adopted the following pledge, signed as follows:

"Believing that the taxpayers of the Nation are about to shoulder the greatest tax burdens in our history, and believing also that economy should be practiced in our Government as well as in our household, we, as patriotic farmers of Adams County, Ind., do hereby pledge ourselves to refrain from the acceptance of any Government Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments for the growing or nongrowing of any crops, livestock, etc., on our respective farms. (Beet-processing tax payments not included.)

"And consistent with this undertaking, and in a spirit of contributing in every possible manner to the cause of victory and of national abundance, security, and stability, we further pledge ourselves to produce to the limit of our ability all of the things which we are best equipped to produce.

"It is the intention of these men to let Congress know that the farmers of the Nation are willing to do their patriotic duty without Government pay.

"Other farmers of the county will have the opportunity to sign the pledge as the pledges

are posted in elevators over the county, and those wishing to sign can do so.

"It is hoped that this movement started by a group of Allen County, Ind., farmers, will spread across this Nation, and their checks which amount to more than a billion dollars a year will be retained by the Treasury of the United States of America for guns, planes, and other necessary equipment for winning this war. This may shorten the war by many months.

"With the prices farmers receive for their products, no farmer needs this handout at this time.

"Some of the things different farmers remarked, who signed this pledge, are:

"We will stop the sayings that the farmers have to be paid to be patriotic."

"One farmer who would get a large check remarked, 'Take it for other things. I can get along.' Another man reasoned, 'If we turn this money back, interest will not have to be paid, but if we farmers take these checks and turn them into bonds, interest will have to be paid for 10 years, besides the principal.'

"Still another farmer deprecates the idea of a hundred thousand men running over this county drawing pay at this time when the country is struggling to keep on its feet with debts piling up and the boys fighting for their lives in the Philippines and other places.

"A collection was taken up for the Red Cross, this totaled \$17. This money has been turned in."

"C. D. Putnam and A. T. Hixon, well known Allen County farmers, spoke. Both stressed the idea that farmers should raise more food-stuff and should refrain from taking money for doing so.

"That, there is no surplus of corn or wheat at this time in Allen or Adams Counties on account of the increased feeding program, before fall there will probably be a shortage as a large percent of the farmers are already buying feed to finish their livestock.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] for 3½ minutes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is to be commended when it shows or displays a keen interest in administrative economy, but that is an altogether different proposition from cutting out authority for granting loans to needy farmers.

I have had occasion to visit Farm Security clients in my district during the past year, men who have become self-supporting and self-sustaining units in the economic life of the area by virtue of the fact that we enabled them to make certain low-interest loans in order to purchase food, supplies, and equipment with which to conduct their farming operations. I believe this House would make a very serious mistake if it felt impelled as a matter of economy to strike out or reduce the amount set out in this bill which authorizes the R. F. C. to make loans to these needy farmers. These are not grants; this is not charity. This is an effort to help the man who needs help, the man who cannot go to his bank, who cannot go to his supply merchant or to other credit facilities in the area and offer sufficient collateral or sufficient security with which to obtain a needed loan but who can go to a governmental agency which is exhibiting an interest in his welfare and making an attempt to keep him off relief by lending a helping hand. While it is true these are not gilt-edged loans; while it is true that some losses

will be sustained, I submit that the effort displayed here to lift a man from that substrata in which he has been living to a higher and better plane of life and encouraging him to be self-sustaining, is an effort worth while. It is a good investment, not only in dollars and cents, although we may lose a few dollars and cents, but it is a fine investment in human values, in spiritual as well as material value. Men who are obtaining these loans feel they have a Government which is taking a direct interest in their welfare, a Government that is not giving them something but a Government sufficiently interested to lend a helping hand. These farmers are entitled to be encouraged in their efforts to improve their status.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct some of the statements that have been made here that the whole Farm Bureau Federation is in favor of reducing drastically the appropriation for, or perhaps eliminating altogether, the Farm Security Administration. When we started to consider this bill sometime last week I was very much surprised to receive a letter from my State farm bureau federation president. So I wrote to a leader in that organization and I received his answer, that I will include in my statement. Knowing him and knowing the farm bureau folks in Wisconsin, having worked with them when I was president of the old American Society of Equity, I knew they were exactly the same as we were, so I could not understand it. My good friend, Max Leopold, is not in accord with his national president, and says that the State president simply followed Mr. O'Neal. Mr. Leopold is one of the leaders, who attends all of the national conventions, and is one of the most active fellows in behalf of the farmers I have ever met.

His letter is as follows:

WOOD COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Vesper, Wis., March 10, 1942.

Hon. B. J. GEHRMANN,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND BARNEY: I was glad to receive your letter of March 7 in regard to the fight now taking place in Congress as to the value and the merits of the Farm Security Administration.

To make myself clear, to me the whole fight that is going on now between O'Neal and Baldwin is more or less a fight of means of methods of achieving goals rather than the principle of farm security. I believe it was at the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau held in Chicago at the Stevens Hotel in 1939, where I was present, where the whole farm-credit system was discussed from all angles—farm tenancy, Federal land bank loans, and Farm Security. I was sure at that time that O'Neal was very sound in his constructive criticism on all these branches, and Baldwin was present at that meeting, and that it was unanimously agreed that the Farm Bureau would continue to support those agencies and maintain its right as a national farm organization at all times to bring before the Federal Land Bank System, the farm tenancy, and Farm Security such sug-

gestions, recommendations, or criticisms that would tend to make these agencies more flexible to the needs of the farmers of America and help build a more stable and more secure individual farm ownership in America. My own experience with Farm Security in the State of Wisconsin, and I am sure you know that I know a good many of the supervisors, is that it is doing a good job. I don't mean that no mistakes are made in the selection of clients or in the extension of credits, but I want to assure you that the men I know have honestly and sincerely tried to bring back to the farms men who have in many cases, through no fault of their own, lost their homes or lost hopes in maintaining a home because of lack of income caused by drought and depressed commodity prices.

Therefore I know the Farm Security is doing a good job keeping and placing farmers back on the farm around here. In our county Mr. A. P. Bean, president of the Wood County Farm Bureau, is a member of the advisory committee of Farm Security, and in many counties where you have men like A. P. Bean there can be no question of the integrity of the work being done. It goes that way in our own State, and I believe in our Nation, and it proves to me that the principle of Farm Security is sound.

Now, in reply to your letter as to the action taken by Roscoe Smith, our State president. I believe that he just did that to comply with a request from the national office, and not from his own experience with Farm Security work. In fact, our own president from our county received a letter from Roscoe asking him to write to every Congressman and United States Senator from Wisconsin to vote or work against the Farm Security, and he refused to do so, as he could not justify the statement made in the enclosed copy of a form letter.

I don't know the troubles the Farm Bureau has with the Farm Security in the Southern States, and I don't know whether Farm Security pays dues to the Farmers' Union in Minnesota or North Dakota. I don't know if Farm Security tries to bring back to the people in the Southern States their born rights as citizens by paying their poll tax and thereby give them a chance to exercise their rights as citizens, and I don't know whether the county agents in the Southern States are collecting dues for the Farm Bureau or the county agricultural association in the Southern States are forcing the farmers to pay dues to the county farm bureau as a condition to getting their soil-conservation check. These are all incidents in the life of the people and does not destroy the value of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, or the Extension Division, or the Farm Security, or the general farm organization. What we need in every county, State, and our Nation are men with principle and character like A. P. Bean, our own president of the Wood County Farm Bureau, and believe me, Barney, there are tens of thousands in the United States like him—and what we lack is that in many counties in our States these men are not given the leadership, and we run into some others with political or economical axes to grind, and then condemn everything. Therefore I wish to state that I personally don't agree with anyone, whether he is president of the American Farm Bureau, Farmers' Union, or Grange, if he does not care to see the whole picture, but is too quick on destroying because he may not like the individual in the program. So if Ed O'Neal is against Baldwin, or any other individual in the Farm Security, and tries to abolish the Farm Security, I sure am not in favor of that. You may make use of this letter if you need it.

Yours truly,

WOOD COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
MAX LEOPOLD, Secretary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, from the attendance in the Chamber at this time I assume that the main fight on this bill is over. However, may I say that we are dealing with one of the most important activities and policies of the Federal Government when we deal with Farm Security and help people who are seeking to become self-sustaining and get off relief.

We hear much talk these days to the effect that there is no more frontier, that there is no more land, that there is no longer opportunity for people to go back to the land. Let me remind you, in answer to that statement, that there is lots of land. There are great unsettled portions of the West, in the cut-over regions of the western States, and I refer particularly to the Northwest, the State of Idaho, the State of Washington, the State of Oregon, and northern California. There is much good agricultural land out there awaiting settlement.

People in the congested industrial centers, where employment has played out, good, worthy, thrifty, frugal people who are seeking a chance to become self-sustaining and a chance to get back on the land, have migrated to these cut-over sections of the West. I know that in the five northern counties of the State of Idaho the Farm Security Administration has come to the assistance of these worthy people who are seeking to get established. These people must have help, they must have financial assistance to reclaim the land, build a little home and get started. They must have land enough so that they may become self-sustaining and that is where the Farm Security has come in.

From my long experience in connection with this cut-over region, and in connection with my work of reclaiming cut-over land, and I state this from firsthand experience, it has been long apparent to me that some agency should be created to come to the assistance of good, worthy people who went onto this land but had not the means of reclaiming enough land to become self-supporting. In these days of machinery, when machinery and explosives are available, but there is no capital, the Farm Security Administration has come in and made a heavy outlay. May I say to the members of the committee that one of these big, modern, heavy caterpillar bulldozers costs about \$8,000. An individual farmer, or even a small group of farmers, cannot finance the purchase of this kind of machinery, and the Farm Security Administration in financing the purchase and operation of the machinery to be repaid by the farmers has greatly advanced the welfare of the farmers on cut-over land.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because it is based upon a false assumption—the assumption that the war has solved all our other economic problems. We of the Middle West know this is not so. We have not been the beneficiaries to any extent of the tremendous defense spending program, and, if anything, the war has augmented our problems.

The major contribution which the Middle Western States will make to the war effort is the production of greatly increased supplies of food and fiber products. To achieve that production, I believe that every reasonable step should be taken to aid those upon whom we must depend for such production. The war has not solved the problems of thousands of small-farm families which have been dispossessed of their holdings because of the depression and long-extended drought. These families are still looking for a helping hand to assist them in getting back onto the farms. It is the duty of the Federal Government to help them now just as much as it was in years gone by.

Adoption of this amendment, reducing the appropriation by \$20,000,000, will deprive many needy farm families of the opportunity to get off relief and back onto their feet as producing farmers. On the other hand, a small investment by the Federal Government through these rehabilitation loans will enable thousands of these families to get back on the land, and in addition to providing subsistence for themselves they can contribute greatly to meeting the increased demand for foodstuffs.

I have received hundreds of complaints from farmers which indicate that we may fall far short of our food-production goals this year due to the fact that so many of our young men from the farms have either been drafted into military service or have taken jobs in defense industries. It is important, therefore, that families which have previously made their living from the farms be given the means to return. Most of the men who lost their farms during the drought period are heads of families, too old for military service, and who hesitate to leave their families for defense jobs. They are experienced in farm work and will gladly return to farm work if they can get one of these small rehabilitation loans to buy the most essential equipment. Why should we not take advantage of this great untapped labor force and put it to work building one of the most essential weapons we have to win this war—the production of food? By giving them a little help at the start, and with the added incentive of increased farm prices, these families can take a long stride forward toward again becoming self-sustaining.

I think the record of the Farm Security Administration in this rehabilitation program thus far justifies its continued operation and justifies the appropriation recommended by the committee. I therefore urge that the amendment to reduce this appropriation by \$20,000,000 be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to reduce by only \$20,000,000 a \$70,000,000 appropriation for rehabilitation loans to farmers. There is a provision in the bill on page 85, in the next paragraph, which the committee has inserted, limiting the appropriation so that none of the funds under these paragraphs on the two or three preceding pages can be used for the purchase of land or the carrying on of any land-purchase program. These items for the purchase of land and carrying on land-purchase programs would run into millions of dollars.

There is also a limitation prohibiting any experiment in collective farming. That also would run into millions of dollars.

There is a further limitation prohibiting loans in excess of \$2,500. This would also reduce the total amount that should be required.

On top of that, with farm prices as they are today, most of these people are able to secure advances and loans from local and private banks and other sources. With that in mind, the suggestion that we reduce this item from \$70,000,000 to \$50,000,000 would mean a very small reduction. It will not hamper any legitimate operation that might be conceived of in connection with the proposition. There is no question in the world that the farmers will be able to be financed liberally under this situation.

Of course, these loans are not all repaid. The percentage rate of repayment is approximately 72 or 73 percent, when you come to consider the principal repayments.

I do not believe we will be justified in appropriating, with these limitations in the bill which cut down the demand, any more than the \$50,000,000 the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has proposed. I hope the members of this Committee will see to it that they practice some economy, and that these people are permitted to save for the Treasury through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at least \$20,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment I shall offer to the next paragraph. The purpose of the amendment is to reduce the amount of the loan that may be made to any individual farmer from \$2,500 to \$1,000.

I call attention to the fact that the average loan that has heretofore been made under this program throughout the entire United States is \$277. The highest average loan is in the State of Washington, \$908. In view of the fact that the committee has already placed certain restrictions on the use of this money and has definitely provided that in the future no part of it may be used for the purchase of land or the carrying on of any land-purchase program, or for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except to liquidate

those particular projects, it occurs to me that unless we restrict this amount to \$1,000 the officials of the Farm Security Administration may unnecessarily increase the amount of the individual loans.

I am not familiar with the situation in other sections of the country, but I know that no tenant farmer in North Carolina is furnished anything like \$2,500 to use in the cultivation of a crop. Therefore, it occurs to me that we should place a restriction on the authority to loan, and it seems to me that \$1,000 is a reasonable limitation because—and I refer to the record—the average loan in no State at the present time is in excess of \$1,000. Why should we more than double the average that exists at the present time? It seems to me that this limitation of \$2,500 might be considered as an indication to the Farm Security Administrators that Congress would like for them to make loans up to \$2,500.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the gentleman tell me what the average has been in Texas?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I think I have it right here. In Texas the average loan was \$232. In my own State it was \$276, or \$1 below the average throughout the country.

Mr. KEEFE. What was it in Wisconsin?

Mr. COOLEY. In Wisconsin it was \$466.

Mr. PIERCE. In Oregon?

Mr. COOLEY. In Oregon it was \$586, well within the limitation provided by my amendment.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman have the figure with regard to Minnesota?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; \$541.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman give me the figures for Nebraska?

Mr. COOLEY. Nebraska, \$319.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the work the Farm Security Administration has been doing with these rehabilitation loans, and I am very much in opposition to the pending amendment.

I do want to say a word, however, about a very distinguished gentleman whose name has been drawn into these debates. I refer to Mr. Ed O'Neal, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, a distinguished son of Alabama and a constituent of mine, a man who has been a farmer all of his life, who is still a farmer, and who has the interest of the farmers at heart.

I am just as much opposed to Mr. O'Neal's attack on the Farm Security Administration as anybody can be. I am a member of the Farm Bureau myself. I think Mr. O'Neal is wrong, and I think the leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation is wrong in taking this

stand with reference to the Farm Security Administration.

Further, as a lowly member of that organization and as a farmer, I say that I do not believe the rank and file of the membership of the American Farm Bureau Federation bear him out in his opposition to the Farm Security Administration. I know that in the State of Alabama our people are proud of Ed O'Neal, they are proud of the leadership he has manifested for the farmers of America. They believe in him. They pay tribute to him as a great farm leader. But in this fight I do not believe that the people in Alabama are any more in agreement with Mr. O'Neal than I am, and I think that spirit has been manifested by the editorials that have appeared in the Alabama papers since this fight has been taken up.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me finish this statement first, if I may.

I do want to make it very clear that even though I find myself in great disagreement with Mr. O'Neal and the leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation, I recognize that the stand which he takes is an honest stand and it is simply an honest difference of opinion between people and the kind of difference of opinion that all of us have a right to have. I want to stand before you today and pay tribute to Ed O'Neal as a great leader of a great organization and a man who has done a tremendous amount of good for the farmers of America, even though he is wrong in this instance.

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. In what respect has the Farm Bureau's criticism of the Farm Security Administration been unjust or unfair?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have time to go into all of that. For instance, it has been said that the Farm Bureau is advocating this cut, whether it is true or not, I do not know, but it has been said here on the floor that it is. This is money that goes to the farmers and it is to help to produce the food that is necessary to be produced if we are to win this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we have been having a sort of guerilla warfare in connection with this farm bill for over a week. I want to say that while some of the cuts which have been made are, in my opinion, justifiable, I do feel that some of them have been too drastic. As one representative of a farm State, however, I trust that the same gentlemen who have been leading this economy drive on the farmer will not lose their zeal as we continue to go into other non-defense expenditures week after week and day after day for the duration of the session.

We are all interested in economy and saving every possible place we can these days, and now that a start, and a rather substantial one, has been made on this bill, I think it would be wholesome if this same group would see to it that the

paring knife is not put away to gather dust until next year when the agricultural bill again comes before the House. Let us continue to save every possible dime and dollar in all nondefense items so that we can throw the full strength of America into our No. 1 job of winning this war.

We had a lot of conversation and argument going on a short time ago in connection with the Farm Security Administration when Mr. DIRKSEN's other amendment was up for curtailing travel expenses and administrative costs. I want to make it clear that this new amendment however is not directed at administrative costs. His present proposal is to cut from \$70,000,000 to \$50,000,000 the funds available to the farmer in this bill. It would be a cut right out of the farmers and it is a cut that is directed at a point where the farmers can least afford to stand such a cut.

In the first place, the fellow aided by the F. S. A. is the little farmer, not the big operator, not the fellow in position to get a big conservation check from the Government. He is the little fellow struggling along on a margin of existence. In the second place, he is the struggling farmer, because he has had difficulty from various disasters, grasshoppers, droughts, insects, and so forth, and because of the difficulties he has encountered he is struggling to rehabilitate himself. Yet you are trying to cut \$20,000,000 out of his appropriation. In the third place, he is a stubborn fellow because he will not give up and he will not quit. He does not want to go on relief, he does not want to move to town, but he wants to stay there on the farm and make good in the farming business. Yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] proposes to take from that little fellow his last ray of hope by this reduction of \$20,000,000, which comes out of his pocket and stops him in his courageous climb back to solvency and independence.

May I suggest in all fairness that if the rest of America were as well prepared for this war as the farmers of America, we could deliver the knock-out blows to the Axis aggressors which they so abundantly deserve before Saturday night. That is because the farmer of America has worked hard for 10 or 12 or 14 or even 16 hours a day, because he has not gone out on strike, because he has not always exacted his pound of flesh. He has given us a food reserve 12 or 18 months in advance, and has done all this without subsidy and without the benefits of either a floor under his income or a negotiated contract guaranteeing him a fair return on his investment.

Mr. Chairman, by dint of hard labor, personal sacrifice, long hours, and careful planning the American farmer has produced a reserve supply of food capable not only of feeding America but many of the people of the United Nations for months to come. The American farmer has shown this country the road to victory by demonstrating that ample production requires hard work, long hours, sweat, sacrifice, and stubborn persistency in the face of discouraging odds. When industry, labor, political planners, and

the rest of the country catches up with the farmer, the victory which we all desire will come to light wearing a "made in America" label and ushering in an era of peace which Americans must help plan, prepare, and perpetuate in order that war may henceforth be banned from this universe.

By making adequate appropriations through the Farm Security Administration, by defeating this proposed \$20,000,000 cut if you please, we are helping the little fellow add his bit to the food production program of America and we are helping to rehabilitate thousands of honest and industrious farmers who prefer hard work to relief and whose protection is essential if rural populations are not to drift to the cities and if large-scale corporate farming is not to replace the family size farm and independent farm ownership and operation. Let us correct any abuses and excesses which may exist in the Farm Security Administration but let us not vote this \$20,000,000 out of the pockets of the most needy class of farmers in this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, may I remind this House that at the \$70,000,000 figure provided by the committee in this bill, the Farm Security Administration will still be operating next year with \$50,000,000 less than it had for the preceding year when we appropriated \$120,000,000 for this same purpose. The reduction of that \$50,000,000 indicates that progress is being made, that farmers are being rehabilitated, that loans are being repaid, and that this service is accomplishing the task set before it. Let us not, however, disrupt the entire program now by making a capricious cut of another \$20,000,000, carelessly arrived at, and thus deprive the needy farmers, who still need assistance, of the opportunity to rehabilitate themselves, remain off relief, stay on the farm, and gear themselves back into profitable and paying farm operations.

I urge you to give this matter your serious consideration, each of you, and to vote against Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment to cut another \$20,000,000 from this program. Let us defeat this amendment, to help free American farmers remain free and independent. Let us defeat it to help them help us produce the foodstuffs essential to the winning of this war and to the feeding of the starving people of the world after the war. Let us defeat it as a measure of economy in the saving of human souls and the preservation of family life on the small-sized farm which has done so much to build America and which can contribute so much to its continued greatness.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

DEFENDS FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION REHABILITATION FUND

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of many of the items that have been considered here for the past few days, several Members of the House who have been active in the organized fight to slash appropriations for various activities almost indiscriminately have stood on the floor of this House and in effect professed their

devotion for the farmer. Time and time again we have been told by Members that they were for every dollar in this bill that will go direct to the farmer, but were opposed to any item that might carry funds for administrative expense. That has been the burden of their argument. Now, here is an opportunity to prove your faith by your vote.

We are now considering an item, not \$1 of which is for or can possibly be expended for administrative expense; not \$1 of which is for travel or for office help. It is my desire that those who have been giving lip service to these poor landless farmers understand that every dollar of this appropriation will actually go to assist needy farmers who are unable to secure help, loans, or credit elsewhere.

As has been stated, the appropriation for this important rehabilitation work was \$120,000,000 last year, and even the worst critics are unable to point to \$1 that has been squandered. Nor can they truthfully say that any of these funds have been wasted. Yet the committee has cut and slashed this one item exactly \$50,000,000. No one has ever charged the gentleman from Georgia with being a spendthrift.

The distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] would have us believe that the Farm Security Administration has had difficulty in finding needy clients. That may be true in the State of Virginia. I do not know. The great State of Virginia, now a virtual arsenal for the war program, may not have any of these desperately needy farmers. But that condition certainly does not prevail in Oklahoma and I am certain the same is true in many other States.

Despite the fact, Mr. Chairman, that these farmers are landless and homeless and that their incomes have been small because of persistent droughts in certain areas and unusual floods in others, and for the further reason that farm prices until very recently have been unreasonably low, not one of the 768,000 farmers that have been rehabilitated under this program have gone out on a strike. They have not struck for higher wages nor for shorter hours. Yet these farmers have worked in the fields from sun to sun and in many instances from daybreak until dark, eking out a meager living for themselves and their families. They have not sabotaged the defense program but are loyal, patriotic citizens. They have sent their sons to fight and die if need be for the defense of the country and now they will be called upon to play an important part in feeding the civilian population or our armed forces and that of our Allies.

In this connection I want to remind Members that so far as the farmers of the country, large and small, are concerned, agriculture is much better prepared for war than is the industrial section. In fact, the farmer by his long hours of toil has produced vast surpluses of farm commodities, a thing that the country can well be proud of. Except for those farm surpluses I shudder to think where our Nation would be today so far as the food supply is concerned. There is no surplus in the steel market or industry, yet one steel concern has received a contract of \$1,500,000,000 in

Government contracts. The Government will pay enormous sums to a few such concerns, amounting to many times more than all the subsidies and benefits that will go to all the farmers of the United States. Again I remind Members that we must depend on the small farmers to produce the food to win this death struggle that the enemies of civilization have thrust upon us.

Mr. KEEFE. And the farmers are to pay it back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that, so far as the farm-tenant-purchase program is concerned, despite the dire predictions to the contrary, those farmers are paying off their loans in advance of maturity. Moreover, even these rehabilitation loans, made to 768,000 men who were unable to secure loans elsewhere, they, too, have surprised even officials of the Farm Security Administration as well as Members of Congress by repaying their loans. They have already repaid over \$200,000,000 of these loans that few expected would ever be paid. These little farmers have demonstrated that all they really wanted was an opportunity to make good. The F. S. A. has been the direct means of assisting these desperately needy farmers to increase their own assets some \$500,000,000. That cannot be laughed off or answered with mere sarcasm and ridicule. It has made better citizens of them and made them feel that their Government is interested in them and that they have a country and a Government that they can be proud to fight for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the seat of intelligence is in the head. The seat of emotions is in the abdomen. I like to see the House legislate by means of the former of these two portions of the human anatomy. Only as an example I would like to point out, however, that awhile back we adopted an amendment to cut \$300,000 out of the appropriation for the control of the Japanese beetle, because one Member made a speech in which he said, "Let us fight the Japs instead of fighting the beetle," and that was all the House needed. The committee that studied the matter decided that the amount carried in the bill was needed to control this very dangerous pest. The House cut almost all of it out on a mere quip.

We are now talking about saving the taxpayers' money. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] indicates he is going to save the taxpayers a lot of money by denying \$20,000,000 of loans to distressed farmers, loans, mind you, nearly all of which will be repaid. I have some figures here and maybe they will help Members to visualize just what the real truth—the relative importance of things—really is. We decided recently to increase the debt limit to \$125,000,000,000, which is the top line on my chart here. The next line represents the amount of an appropriation bill recently passed by the House, and the third line is the amount of lend-lease appropriations so

far for food alone. The next is the appropriation bill under consideration when it started through the House, but it is less than that now. Now I expect it amounts to about \$600,000,000, hardly a third of the amount appropriated last year. This particular item for farm security already had been cut by \$60,000,000 by the committee before the bill ever came in. Then the amount was cut by another amendment by the gentleman from Illinois to the extent of \$25,000,000, and he now proposes to cut \$20,000,000 more, so that the bill will carry for this whole program for the low-income farmers only about \$80,000,000, against \$184,000,000 last year.

What are we going to say to these people? You know who they are. The Farm Security Administration, or some mistake in administration, is not the issue here. It is not an issue of the sort of relocation of farmers dispossessed by military authorities that the gentleman complained about and that the Comptroller General said that the Farm Security could not continue any more. Farm Security only undertook this because it was instructed to, anyway. And yet it is proposed to "take it out" on the little farmers. That is all out. The gentleman knows it as well as I do. His amendment will not have a thing to do with the relocation of these people. This money for rehabilitation loans is, every cent of it, to go to a group of people who have given more volunteers to the American Army than any other kind of people in the United States. Do you expect those boys who go out and volunteer to feel happy when they get word that Congress, in order to make a pretense—yes, a pretense—of saving the taxpayers' money, is going to cut off more than half of these rehabilitation loans to their families at home? This amendment really means that the Farm Security Administration will not be able to loan a few dollars to a poor family so it can buy a few chickens and a pig or two. This amendment is like saying to them: "You can go back to one-crop farming; back to growing just one crop that will exhaust your soil; and, when you cannot do anything else, then you can go to California; and, when you get there, become a migrant worker." Another amendment already adopted has said to these same people: "There will be no more migratory labor camps at all, but you can live behind a sign post or out on the road." I ask Members from the Pacific coast to think about some of these things.

No, gentlemen, the issue here is not an agency nor travel expenses. The issue is the poor farm people.

From such families as these have come some of America's greatest men. These are the people who bred that long line of log-cabin Presidents, who gave this Nation Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln.

I want them to be able to go on tilling America's soil, but I want them to own a piece of it. I want that because I believe the small family farm is the most important cement that holds any democracy together. I want them to be helped to hold their farms, helped now when they can more certainly make a

go of it. I want them to be helped to have some livestock, some diversification in their crops. It will help our whole Nation.

It is from just such families that hundreds of thousands of American soldiers are being taken today—taken for the Army this Congress voted to build. Do you want those boys to hear from home that the hope their folks had of one day owning a little place and building it up so the son could be a better farmer, a more hopeful citizen than his father was—do you want those boys to hear from home that the same Congress that drafted them told their folks it was through being concerned about them and that so far as it was concerned they could look in vain for a helping hand and hit the open road again to try to find a place in California?

When I have finished you will be urged by more finished orators than I to be sensible about this matter, to remember we are at war, to be done with social reform. Great God; since when is it social reform to bolster the American family farm, to add to the number of people who own a piece of America's precious soil and thus become a part of the bedrock of this Nation's institutions? That is no radical doctrine. It is the only true conservatism. And if these things be said to have nothing to do with the war, let me remind the House that it is upon these 3,000,000 farmers that we must primarily depend for increased production and the success of our food for production program.

The issue here is whether or not the one program that has been of substantial aid to the very poorest but some of the very best and most completely American people in our whole country shall go on.

This amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago this Committee refused to vote cuts in the soil-conservation program. I strongly commend the Committee for that action. Conservation of the soil and conservation of the forests are highly important in this country. But what about human conservation? What about conserving human values? How infinitely more important it is that we also see that the underprivileged in this country are given an opportunity to stand on their own feet again. Of what value is it if we conserve the soils and the forests without providing the physical and mental endowments necessary for our people to properly utilize the soils and the forests? Gentlemen, the Farm Security Administration is an organization which helps our underprivileged, our needy people to stand on their own feet.

Let me quote briefly some of the things the Farm Security Administration has done in my own district for people who are now enjoying the benefits of rehabilitation.

The net income of those people is more than twice as much as it was before they had the benefits of the rehabilitation

program. Per annum the actual amounts are \$509 as contrasted with \$295. The value of food produced for home use has increased two and one-half times, or from \$126 to \$298. The amount of milk produced for home use is nearly double, with 414 gallons being produced now as against 237 before F. S. A. Pounds of meat produced for home use is more than double—the amounts are 533 pounds and 253 pounds. Here is an item I want you to keep in mind: Fruits and vegetables canned for home use before F. S. A., 86 quarts; after F. S. A., 273 quarts.

Do you know what they use to put up those fruits and vegetables? Pressure cookers, the things which one gentleman has stated on this floor were being used for slop jars. Obviously, people are using most of them for their rightful purposes. Down in my country we use them to can fruits and vegetables.

Last year we had available for the item of rehabilitation \$125,000,000. This bill cuts the amount available down to \$70,000,000, yet here we are asking to further reduce it to \$50,000,000. Such an amendment must have one effect only. It would cut off a great many people from a valuable and helpful program, leaving them nowhere else to turn. For what can they turn to if we eliminate this provision? I grant that some of the people now on rehabilitation have been rehabilitated to the point that they can continue to operate without further help from F. S. A., but let me point out to you there is no general war prosperity. The profits of this war are not spread evenly over the country. There are wide areas where the only pronounced effect of war activities has been to increase materially the living costs and farm operating costs of the people. Many of these people would find it necessary either to go to W. P. A. or back into the rut from which they came. For each person who goes to W. P. A., the cost to the Government will be three or four times as much as the cost of aiding a family on F. S. A. Your F. S. A. client borrows his money. He is making himself a self-dependent citizen. He is working toward the time when he can stand on his own feet.

For every person deprived of the advantages of the rehabilitation program, with its sensibly supervised food-production program, there must be a corresponding reduction in the amount of food available for our war effort. This very important item is in itself sufficient to justify the defeat of the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment would seriously limit, would help to destroy one of the finest programs yet developed for the conservation of human values.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I was cut short on the speech I was delivering a few minutes ago. I think I should carry on here. I might call your attention to the fact that in the first part of my speech this morning I referred to the fact that Mr. Edward O'Neal, head of the Farm Bureau, was in the gallery yesterday directing activities. I notice he was there

again today, but that right after the big slash in this bill he left the gallery. Oh, but he is back there again. His lieutenants—you know who they are—left then, but his lieutenants are back here now, and at his beck and call to hamper the small farmer. I wonder if they are looking for another slash at the expense of the poor, small farmer? Yes; I said it was their type who were the ones that fought price control, rationing, adequate corporate income taxes. They are the ones who demand that inflation be halted by slashing appropriations for this and other agencies that are necessary to the war program.

The citizens emergency committee and the Farm Bureau Federation is nothing more than the new front of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Republican National Committee, hired to do their dirty work at a time when it is considered bad manners to indulge in politics. Yes, you men on the Republican side can cheer now, but you did not cheer before Pearl Harbor. You went down against lease-lend. I wonder if you are going to cheer the boys who are now fighting on the front over there when they come back and they find that you were the ones who slashed the program that was helping their fathers and mothers.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I refuse to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Why do not you talk where the votes are? Go over there and talk where the votes are.

Mr. HOOK. The votes were solid on the Republican side.

Mr. KEEFE. Go over there and talk where the votes are. Do not talk to us.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, under the bill that was brought in by the subcommittee a provision was included which prevents the Farm Security Administration from purchasing land. This land was largely purchased for the purpose of reestablishing farmers and tenants who were dispossessed of their lands on account of the building of cantonments and war-industry plants in various parts of the country. If that resettlement program is to go out of the window on account of not being authorized by statute, there must be some legislation by which some agency is given authority to do something about the owners and tenants who are dispossessed on account of the war activities, and who are without funds to acquire new homes or the opportunity to acquire new tenant contracts.

On page 294 of the hearings it is shown that in 22 States, 18,000 farm families have been dispossessed on account of defense activities; that over 2,180,600 acres of land have been taken out of the hands of these families and turned over to these war activities. If a man obtains a reasonable amount for his farm when he is compelled to give it up to the Government, it may or may not

constitute a great hardship, but he may have tenants on his place, sharecroppers and others who work there, and who might be deprived of their opportunity to make a living by reason of their eviction.

It is that group, Mr. Chairman, to which no consideration is given under the terms of this bill. Something must be done to assist them to relocate, in proper cases. Down in my State when Camp Robinson was built and 40,000 acres were taken out of cultivation and use by the owners, they were given just 6 months' rental on a year's lease, and told to go. Many had nowhere to go, no money with which to buy lands; and but for the Farm Security Administration, which came to their aid, many would have been turned out without a dime.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, which will reduce the authorization for obtaining from the R. F. C. funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers. The amount carried in the bill is \$70,000,000, and represents a reduction of \$50,000,000 under the amount of the authorization carried in the 1942 bill. The amendment reduces the limit of loans by an additional twenty million.

These loans are for the purpose of assisting needy farmers to procure stock, personal property, and farm equipment necessary to enable them to carry on their farm operations. On page 282 of the hearings is a table showing the amount of these loans, cumulative to June 30, 1941, and showing the amount of the loans, maturities, collections, and the percentages of collections as compared with maturities. A vast majority of the individual States shows a very high percentage of repayments. The total for the whole Nation shows loans, \$564,051,844; maturities, \$252,697,527; and collections, \$202,634,600—or a national average of 80.2 percent, which I submit to the committee is a very good average, considering the fact that the loans are made to a group that is least financially able to repay them. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that the record of repayments made by needy farmers, both under the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act, where the percentage of repayments is 99 percent, and under the loan rehabilitation program, where, as just stated, it is 80.2 percent, is absolutely astonishing and reflects high credit on that group.

Why the Member proposing this amendment desires to cripple or destroy this program, which was intended to benefit the lowest-income group of the country, is a mystery to me. Secretary of Agriculture Wickard is calling upon the farmers of the country to increase their production of food and fiber for the winning of the war. It is stated that the large farms of the country are nearly up to their capacity of production, and that the hope of a very large increase over present production lies with the small family-size farms, which heretofore have not been able to produce as much as they should; and the ultimate success of the program of food for victory

will depend to a considerable extent upon the efforts of the small farmers of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAY moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MAY. When I am through talking at the end of 5 minutes, of course, I expect to withdraw this motion, or if that permission is refused me I expect the House to vote it down.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will state the point of order.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have not yielded for a point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under the unanimous-consent agreement all time for debate has expired and the gentleman cannot be recognized on a motion to strike out the enacting clause offered to secure time for debate, and not offered merely to secure time for debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. MAY. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to the gentleman from Missouri for the purpose of his making a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri did not have to ask the gentleman from Kentucky to yield in order to submit a point of order.

Mr. MAY. Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I stated that I offered the motion to strike out the enacting clause, but that I expected at the end of my remarks to withdraw it, or, if permission was not granted me to withdraw it, that I expected the Committee would vote it down. I did not ask them to vote it down. I said I would exercise a right which I have under the rules of the House to ask to withdraw a motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will state his further point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has not said that he was opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Kentucky opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAY. I am in favor of the two amendments, and I am in favor of all the reductions that have been made in these appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not answered the Chair's question. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAY. Does the Chairman mean the entire bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the Chair will indulge me further, we are now operating under a special order of the Committee of the Whole under which debate was closed at the end of an hour. The gentleman now proposes to violate the special order and concedes that is his purpose by announcing that, at the close of his remarks, he will withdraw the motion. But the gentleman is obviously out of order even had he not made that admission, as no one seriously offers a motion to strike out the enacting clause of a bill of this character and the Chair should take judicial notice of that self-evident fact.

The proposal of the motion at this time also violates another rule of the House—a universal rule of debate in every parliamentary body in the world—that the committee shall have the right to close debate.

The proposal of my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky, with whom I have served for many years and for whom I have the highest regard, is all the more flagrant in view of the fact that he could have secured time when the order was made, but made no effort to do so.

Nothing could be more unfair and more conducive of disorder or more at variance with parliamentary equity than the proposal to disrupt the program agreed upon by order of the Committee of the Whole.

The gentleman is not entitled to recognition on such a patent subterfuge.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky qualifies. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MAY. No, I do not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I expect to object to the gentleman's request to withdraw his motion and shall take 5 minutes in opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a point of order.

The gentleman from Kentucky will proceed.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe it to be the responsibility and the duty of every Member of this House to be frank, plain, and open with all of his colleagues. When I find something in the country that I think the House or the committee ought to know I feel it my duty to let them know it. I have just

returned from Kentucky where last night I spoke to the State meeting of the Daughters of the American Revolution. That meeting was made up of citizens of Kentucky from every nook and corner of the State and from every county in the State. The question of the possibility of victory in this war, and the question of the solvency of the Federal Government, and the question of the hope of the people in this country were all of uttermost concern to every one of those great women and men who were there. Not only that, but it was also the topic of common conversation in the lobbies of the hotels. At no time did I hear an utterance other than that the Congress of the United States should go about cutting unnecessary domestic expenses. While I do not say that these amendments that are pending ought or ought not to be adopted, I want to tell you that we are going to see changes in this country and we are liable to see some of them in this House unless we adopt a different attitude and show some sort of effort to cut substantially all nondefense expenses of the Government.

We have been spending money through bureaus of this Government for the last 10 years in an unheard-of way. I am the last man in the House who would oppose doing something to lend a poor man a few dollars if wise to do so, but I think the poor man in this country will be fortunate maybe some of these days if he has any dollars at all. His liberty is gravely threatened, and he may lose that.

I want to call your attention to what I think is the situation, and it is alarming. The cry that you hear in Washington that the people of the country are not alert is a false alarm. At least down that way they know that we are in a war and they know that we are in the most dangerous war this Nation has ever encountered. Frankly, there is considerable doubt in their minds as to what may be the ultimate result, and they are alarmed.

I have not come here to cry out a false alarm, but I do come here to caution the House of Representatives against appropriating money for unnecessary domestic purposes in any line or in any branch of the Government's activities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to detain the House, but someone undoubtedly would have risen for this time. I believe in economy as much as the gentleman from Kentucky could possibly believe in economy, and, in fact, judging from some of the authorizations that have come from his committee that have been the basis for appropriations made by this House, I think I believe in it to a far greater extent than he does.

We are talking now, when we talk about nondefense expenditures, of saving something out of nondefense expenditures in the Budget which total slightly in excess of \$6,000,000,000. We have appropriated since the beginning of this emergency about \$150,000,000,000. We have appropriated over \$80,000,000,000 in large part upon authorizations reported from the gentleman's committee since

the occurrence at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. When the gentleman from Kentucky talks about economy for the first time in the matter of an appropriation to take care of the Department of Agriculture of the Government, he is saving at the spigot while wasting at the bung.

The House has already made very severe cuts in the pending bill. The committee had already made cuts amounting to \$560,000,000 in the appropriations for this Department as compared with the present fiscal year. No other department of the Government has sustained any such cuts in the action taken in regard to their supply bills.

When we passed a bill a little while back for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, that bill was \$15,000,000 above the Budget, not below the Budget. I wonder where the gentleman from Kentucky was at that time that his clarion voice was not heard in this Hall demanding that at least we stay within the Budget in the case of the appropriations for those three Departments. When we have been making other appropriations, some of which have been used for such unworthy purposes as the construction of this huge structure down on Pennsylvania Avenue to take care of the Office of Government Reports, I wonder why the gentleman from Kentucky was not present on the floor making some effort to bring about a reduction in those appropriations.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman intimate or even hint that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House authorized the appropriation or the money to be used for that purpose down there on Pennsylvania Avenue?

Mr. TARVER. No; I will tell you openly what I mean—and this is not an intimation or a hint. I assume the gentleman was here when these huge appropriations were being made for the purposes of an extravagant character. The gentleman was not here then raising his voice and moving to strike out the enacting clause and asking for reductions in those appropriations, even when bills were pending which carried huge sums above the Budget figures. It is only when the bill for the Department of Agriculture and for the benefit of the American farmer is pending, already cut more than \$600,000,000 below the present year, that the gentleman undertakes to tell us about the results of a meeting he had in Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. No; I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 14, noes 123.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 94, noes 114.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. TARVER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 98, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase program; (2) for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) for making loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 85, line 10, after "of", strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$1,000."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard for the full 5 minutes on this amendment. I only want to reiterate what I said a moment ago, that unless we change this limitation on loans to individual farmers from \$2,500, I am very much afraid the Farm Security Administration will be led to believe that the House indicated by this provision that it would be perfectly all right for them to make loans up to that amount in all the different sections of the country.

The average loan throughout the Nation up to date is only \$277, but by this bill we have placed a limitation upon the fund so as to provide that no part of the money can be used to purchase land or to carry on a land-purchase program. Therefore, it is entirely possible that the administrators of the F. S. A. might decide that it would be well for them to buy tractors for tenants or otherwise let them have money in excess of what is actually needed. I know and I believe you know that the purpose of this rehabilitation program has been to aid people in need in the agricultural areas of the country.

I have here a list of the average loans in the different States.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman read into the Record the average loan in the State of Louisiana?

Mr. COOLEY. The average loan in the State of Louisiana is only \$195. If we indicate that that may be increased to \$2,500, there is nothing in the world to prevent the Farm Security Administration from letting a tenant in Louisiana have that amount of money.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Why could we not have some differences in there? For instance, in the cattle country, the livestock country, and the dairy country a loan of \$2,500 might be justified; whereas in the

South there are small farms, one-mule farms, where such a loan would not be justified, and the amount would be lower.

Mr. COOLEY. The average loan in the gentleman's State is only \$319.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I wonder if the gentleman has the average loan figure for the State of Iowa.

Mr. COOLEY. In the State of Iowa it is \$457. My amendment would permit them to more than double that figure.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Can the gentleman give me the figures on the average loan in Oklahoma?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; \$245.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman can give me the figure as to the average loan in the State of Ohio.

Mr. COOLEY. It is \$425.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman give me the figure for New York?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; \$594.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that is a dairy State.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman give the average loan for the State of Indiana?

Mr. COOLEY. Four hundred and seventy-two dollars in the State of Indiana.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I wonder if the gentleman will give me the average amount of the loans in Michigan.

Mr. COOLEY. Six hundred and fifty-eight dollars.

Mr. O'HARA. What is the figure for Minnesota?

Mr. COOLEY. Minnesota, only \$541.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Which State has the highest average?

Mr. COOLEY. The State of Washington has the highest average loan, of \$908.

Mr. MANSFIELD. None of them is up to \$1,000?

Mr. COOLEY. The average loan in no State is in excess of \$908.

Mr. TREADWAY. What is the figure for the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. COOLEY. Six hundred and fifty-eight dollars in Massachusetts.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I suggest that each Member get a copy of the hearings and find out for himself.

Mr. COOLEY. The tables to which I have referred may be found on pages 279 and 280 of part II of the hearings.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the highest loan?

Mr. COOLEY. Nine hundred and eight dollars in the State of Washington. That is the highest average in any one State.

Mr. STEFAN. But what is the highest loan?

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry I do not have that information, but it does seem to me that \$1,000 to a tenant farmer to carry on the cultivation of his crop is quite sufficient.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to find out if it is possible to obtain a limitation of debate on this paragraph.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think a while ago the gentleman indicated that he is in favor of this amendment. I am in favor of it, too.

Mr. TARVER. I am in favor of the amendment, but I do not speak for the subcommittee. There are some gentlemen who are opposed to it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the rules of the House are the tools with which we work. Any injury to them must have far-reaching effect. The securing of 5 minutes' debate is in itself a matter of small importance. But the misuse of an important rule opening the way to daily interference with the established procedure of the House is a matter of serious consequence.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is not talking on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I make the further point, Mr. Chairman, that it is dilatory.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my interest in the matter is purely academic. I have no objection to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, speaking at length on any topic. I am always glad to see him take the floor and I hear him always with interest and edification. But I am certain that on mature consideration he will agree that this use of the rule involves considerations of the most serious import.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, who, as the chairman of the great Committee on Military Affairs, is rendering such invaluable service to national defense.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Missouri is the great parliamentarian of the House, and, perhaps, the greatest in the country. I wonder if there was any more impropriety in the gentleman from Kentucky moving to strike out the enacting clause than there was when the gentleman from Georgia moved to strike out the enacting clause of a bill we had here some time ago to increase the number of cadets at the West Point Military Academy. It was stricken out, and some 200 young men were deprived of an opportunity to get a military education and go into the Army.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I join with the gentleman in appreciation of the importance of the measure to which he refers, but in that instance the motion was offered in good faith, and was in-

sisted upon, and the House by vote approved it and thereby rejected the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Asking you, as an expert on the rules, was it proper for you awhile ago to question the good faith of the gentleman or make the statement that he was not acting in good faith, even if it was true?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman conceded that he was not acting in good faith and that he was not making the motion with the intention of having it acted upon.

Mr. Chairman, I will here insert in the RECORD the remarks made on a similar occasion, on February 26, 1940:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in 1910, in the Sixty-first Congress, John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, at that time a member of the Committee on Rules, a committee consisting of three, the Speaker of the House, the leader of the minority, and Mr. Dalzell, made the statement in the course of debate that the Rules of the House of Representatives of the United States were not only the most perfect system of rules in the world but the most perfect system of procedure that could be devised, so perfect, in fact, that it was doubtful whether any further amendment was possible.

If Mr. Dalzell, great statesman and great parliamentarian that he was, could come back today, he would hardly recognize the rules of the House of Representatives, so completely and so fundamentally have they been revised and rewritten.

In the 30 years that have intervened since that statement was made we have adapted and adjusted our system of procedure until we have evolved through experiment and practice a remarkably serviceable system of procedure. It is possible that the next generation will look back on that statement in the same light in which we now regard the complacent appraisal of the great Pennsylvanian, but at least one thing has been accomplished. We no longer hear discussions on the floor and in the cloakrooms of proposed amendments to the rules. I can recall when the rules were the subject of almost daily debate on the floor and "liberalization" of the rules was an issue in national platforms and campaigns. There were modifications of the rules at the opening of every Congress and a general revision with every change of administration. Only in comparatively recent years have the rules approached a degree of permanent standardization where they have ceased to be the object of comment or complaint. For the present at least, regardless of what the parliamentarians of 1970 may think of them, the rules of the Seventy-sixth Congress answer every requirement.

One practice, however, has grown up, and is being resorted to with increasing frequency of late, which, if continued, will require some change, either in the rules themselves or preferably through the decision of some able and experienced chairman. It is the unwarranted practice of using, on every occasion and any occasion, the motion to strike out the enacting clause for the purpose of obtaining the floor for debate. Of late there is rarely an instance in which a consent agreement is secured to limit debate in the Committee of the Whole but what some Member nullifies the agreement and disregards the established rules of debate by moving to strike out the enacting clause. The Member could have asked to be included at the time debate was agreed on and have had his quota of time in regular order, but he waits until all time has expired and the Committee has closed debate, as is its right, and then disrupts the proceedings by again opening the question to debate

in disregard of the understanding to which all interested Members on both sides of the aisle have agreed, or by vitiating the right of those in charge of the bill to close debate. Such misuse of the motion is unwarranted and is in bad taste and verges on bad faith. If my warm, personal friend from New York will indulge me by permitting me to use his recent motion as an example, in answer to my point of order, he said he had made the motion in good faith.

Now, of course, he did make it in good faith in the sense that he desired to eliminate that provision of the bill. But, as a matter of fact, his only purpose in making the motion was to secure the floor, as is shown by the fact that when he closed his remarks, he closed them, not with the expressed hope that the enacting clause be stricken out, but, as he very plainly said, in the hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut would be agreed to. No such use of the rule was ever contemplated. It is a motion of dignity and high privilege. To prostitute it to such menial use is on a par with invoking the great writ of habeas corpus to release a chicken thief from the village calaboose. It is as unparliamentary as mob rule. It supercedes the fundamental rules of debate. It is neither fair nor logical. It wastes the time of the House and disorganizes established procedure and, to that degree, reflects upon those responsible for the integrity of House and committee procedure.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman advise me, a new Member of the House, what other course a Member may take to get access to the floor if a situation arises such as occurred last Friday, when debate was ruthlessly closed and no time was permitted, except about 34 minutes out of the day, for Members other than committee members to introduce amendments? What other recourse does a Member have except to offer such a motion?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That would not give a Member an opportunity to introduce an amendment; it would merely give him 5 minutes to interfere with the orderly program of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say with regard to the observation of the gentleman from South Dakota that debate was ruthlessly closed, that that, of course, is a matter of opinion; but may I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the debate went along for nearly 2 hours before the motion to limit debate was made by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The right of the House to close debate is indispensable. Without it, debate would proceed endlessly. And the right of the committee or the proponent to close debate is axiomatic. To interfere with either right is disorderly and should be so held by the Chair.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WARREN. * * * I feel quite fortified in having the gentleman take the same position I endeavored to take on Friday on exactly the same question. The gentleman is entirely correct, and I hope that some chairman, some day, will rule accordingly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may state that I was moved to make this comment by the argument on the point of order recently raised by the gentleman from North Carolina. He is one of the ablest parliamentarians of the House, and one of the most efficient presiding officers who occupies the chair, and his point of order was so well taken and so well supported that it is to be

hoped that some strong presiding officer will follow the suggestion made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina and establish this much-needed precedent.

Mr. CROWTHER. But once in 21 years of service have I offended against the rule the gentleman speaks of. This happened on last Friday. Does the gentleman think that such a procedure contains any element of unfairness if the opportunity is given the opposition to rise in opposition to the motion?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am certain the distinguished gentleman from New York, with whom it has been my privilege to serve here so long, understands that I am speaking purely in the abstract and had no personal reference in mind.

Mr. CROWTHER. I would have been very pleased to have had the enacting clause stricken out of the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; but the gentleman attempted to withdraw his motion after he had his 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWTHER. Well, that is customary with a pro forma motion. It was offered as a pro forma motion. [Laughter.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I shall take the full 5 minutes, but I point out the effect that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] might have. While the average loan of course is below \$1,000 in every State in the Union, and while the average in my State, according to the figures that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] quoted, is between \$400 and \$500, I do realize that a great majority of these loans are little seed loans and perhaps for an extra work horse. That goes with the majority of loans made here before, but we are now asked to produce more and more, especially of dairy and livestock products. In that case there are a great many cases where \$1,000 loans would absolutely make it impossible to help a fellow who is deserving, who is about to be foreclosed, and lose what he has, because he is not in a position where he can go to a local bank and borrow the money. He cannot get a loan from the Farm Security Administration unless he is not eligible to borrow at the bank. That fellow may have a mortgage not only on his farm, but on the livestock and other personal property as well, and he could not borrow at the bank. Nowadays a cow is worth from \$100 to \$150, and unless a family has a working unit of eight cows or more, they could not expect to make a living. To limit a loan to \$1,000 I do not believe is fair. It is all right in sections where they raise cotton, or even grain, but it would not do in a livestock or dairy section. I do not believe that we should hastily adopt this amendment without thinking what the consequences may be. Heretofore we have had no limit, and the average throughout the years has been less than \$1,000. I do not see why the Farm Security Administration should go above that average now if it is limited to \$2,500. I think \$1,000 is too low in sections where livestock and dairy farming are the main agricultural pursuits. I hope that the amendment will be rejected, or at least that the livestock and dairy farmers will be exempted from that limitation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. I just pointed out that they have been operating year in and year out without a limitation at all and that in the gentleman's State the average loan is something like \$400. If there was no limit in the past, I cannot see any reason to give them \$2,500 when the average loan throughout the country is only about \$800 or \$900.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Until recently livestock was worth less than half of what it is today. In the case of dairy or livestock farming, it would work a hardship. You could not help those farmers who have to have a working unit which in many instances requires more than \$1,000. Many of them still have mortgages not only on the farm, but on their livestock and on their personal property, and he could not go to the bank and borrow money to redeem the mortgage, and pay the interest, which is at the rate of from 7 to 10 percent and it would only help the small local financier, who holds the mortgage. I do not think it is fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that this table and these figures that have been mentioned are misleading. Speakers have been citing this table of rural rehabilitation loans in the hearings or giving the average loan per farmer. It gives no such thing. The heading of the columns shows that it gives the number of loan agreements. Then the average amount of loan per loan agreement, not per farmer.

From my personal knowledge of the way in which this operates, a man may get an initial basic loan for a few hundred dollars; then he may get a loan for medical expenses, \$15 or \$25; then he may need a supplemental loan for feed, perhaps \$50 or \$60. Each loan constitutes a separate loan agreement. So to take the total number of loan agreements and divide them by the total amount of money loaned does not give the picture we need here. That gives you the average amount of money per loan agreement, but it does not give you the average amount of money loaned per farmer. The figures the gentleman from North Carolina has been citing do not give the picture that is being assumed.

The table he has cited shows 95,000 loan agreements in South Dakota. Now, we do not have many more than 100,000 families in South Dakota, and not half of them are F. S. A. loan clients. Personally, I doubt if there are more than 25,000 or 30,000—but there may be 95,000 loan agreements, the basic loan and two or three or four or five supplementary loan agreements covering small subsequent loans for feed, seed, and so forth. This reduces the average amount per loan agreement.

The language in the bill which it is proposed to amend makes a limitation on the total amount in loans to any individual farmer, and the case for the amendment is being made on something entirely different.

Now, personally, I think that this limitation of \$1,000 would be unwise in any event, because it does not take into ac-

count the type of farming that a farmer may be engaged in. A man who is engaged in livestock farming has a different loan need. Any banker who is engaged in making loans in a livestock country would tell you he would rather make a livestock loan in a sufficient amount so that the farmer would have a sound operating unit than to make several times as many small loans where the farmers would not be able to turn around while his herd is developing.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Would not the effect of the gentleman's amendment be to discriminate against the livestock producers of the West, in Wyoming, Dakota, and Iowa, where they would feed or raise cattle?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Unquestionably that is true. There should be some leeway according to the type of farming in which the loan clients are engaged.

Now, some Members seem to think that these loans are grants or something like that. This rural rehabilitation loan is not a grant. It is an operating loan and ought to be thought of in the same category as a loan to a business. In spite of the fact that they go to persons who cannot borrow at banks, these supervised loans are being collected. I have in my hand a letter from the Administrator in which he states that the collections in this fiscal year up to January 30 were \$63,300,000 as compared with \$38,400,000 in the previous fiscal year. This entire appropriation is repayable. The money comes back to whence it came. It is estimated that by June 30 the total collections for this year will be in excess of \$900,000,000, and we are only appropriating \$70,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. In South Dakota the average loan is only \$168.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sorry, but the gentleman is mistaken in his application of those figures. That table is misleading because the gentleman does not distinguish between loan agreements and loan clients. That average he speaks of is obtained by dividing the total amount loaned by the number of loan agreements. Yet one farmer may have as many as five or six loan agreements. He has his initial loan to set him up; then he has supplementary loan agreements as he needs feed, seed, and so forth. I have some figures with respect to one case. The initial loan was \$493. Later the farmer got a supplementary loan of \$16 for medical treatment. Then he got a supplemental loan of \$40 for feed. Each of those is a loan agreement. So that that one farmer has three loan agreements. So when you divide it up you have a misleading average. You have an average for the loan agreements, but not an average per farmer. In the case just cited, the farmer's three loans total \$549, but the average per loan agreement would be \$183 and that gives a misleading picture.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman think we should make loans to tenant farmers to the amount of \$2,500?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If he is in the livestock business it may be a sounder proposition to loan him \$2,500 than to loan him \$500.

Mr. COOLEY. In no State of the Union has the loan exceeded \$900.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is certainly mistaken; I know personally that loans to individual farmers total more than that. The gentleman is misled by thinking loan agreements and loan clients are the same thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Why is it that there are over a hundred loans made last year in the District of Columbia to farmers, on an average of nearly \$900?

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Those were not made to farmers in the District of Columbia. They were made to farmers in different parts of the country who thereafter removed to the District of Columbia and are now located here.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly, if I may, advise my colleagues as to how I look upon this situation, because I disagreed with my chairman when we wrote this very unusual language into this measure. It is only free from points of order because it comes in under a rule.

We provide that no money shall be used for the purchase or carrying out of any land-purchase program. That is entirely eliminated for the first time. No money shall be used for any collective farming experiment. So we left it merely to this one item, that is, grants, and to rehabilitation.

In all the years this agency has been in action, no abuse is shown. So why place a limitation that may make it impossible for the program to function at all? To my friends from the West, let me say this involves all of these water-facility projects. This involves the large-scale wheat farming and irrigated farming. This also involves debt adjustments. Let me take, as an illustration, a man who has a farm and all equipment worth \$5,000, and his debts are \$6,000. His creditors are willing to adjust for \$4,000, but under this \$1,000 limitation it would not be available to him. If the proponents of this amendment, or anyone else, were able to show any abuses that have existed in the past, then there would be some reason to go along with the amendment.

No basis has been shown to justify this amendment. What you are doing is simply this: If you deny a farmer who requires \$2,000 or \$2,500 to rehabilitate himself, you deny him these benefits and you turn him into that type of farmer who sooner or later is going to come and

ask for a grant; and, of course, when you authorize a grant he must be down in the economic scale and there is no chance of getting any of the money back since it is a gift. As there is no abuse shown in this activity and since it has worked successfully throughout the whole western section, as I have seen it and known it—it has been very beneficial—and since it does not involve the appropriation either by increase or decrease, why should we make this reduction?

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I suppose the limitation by this proposed amendment is intended to save money. Has it been shown to this House that one penny will be saved?

Mr. LEAVY. No; there was no showing. I do not believe that even the proponents of the amendment make that claim.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly I do not make any such ridiculous contention. What I contend is that by reducing the amount you will be able to reach more people and do more good.

Mr. LEAVY. Since the Committee has voted down the amendment to reduce the money available for this service there is no reason to adopt an arbitrary loan limit so small as to make the funds unavailable. I trust the amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY), there were—ayes 82, noes 45.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed \$551,100) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed \$83,700) and 5 (not to exceed \$65,200) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567-568), and acts supplementary thereto, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed \$30,000 for the construction or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements; in all, not to exceed \$700,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary of Agriculture to be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for

allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than three fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph carries \$700,000 for cooperative farm forestry. This amount was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and is broken down in the Bureau's estimate to include \$298,000 for the Prairie States farm forestry project commonly known as the shelterbelt. Last year the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, as finally enacted, carried \$300,000 for this project. The item was not in the bill as it passed the House originally but was introduced as an amendment in the Senate. The conferees failed to agree upon this item and brought it back to the House, where upon a separate vote the conferees were directed to agree to the Senate amendment.

The language contained in this paragraph is the same as that carried in the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, and under the language as it stands, the \$298,000 is authorized to be spent on the shelterbelt project. However, the committee in its report indicates that it does not approve of the expenditure of this fund on the shelterbelt project. The committee's suggestion is certainly most unusual, and with all due respect to the committee, it does not seem to me that the conclusions reached in the report are justified or based upon either facts or sound reasoning. The section of the report dealing with this matter reads as follows:

The Budget proposal is to allot \$300,000 of this fund to the so-called shelterbelt project. It is believed that the Norris-Doxey Act was passed by Congress with the thought in mind that the appropriations to implement it should be allotted among the several States in some equitable ratio, such as one based on the total farm acreage in each of such States adapted to forestry. Of the total appropriation of \$700,000, but \$551,100 is allotted to the Norris-Doxey Act and more than half of the latter sum, namely \$300,000, is set up by the Budget for expenditure on the shelterbelt project. The committee disapproves of such a patently unfair and unwise distribution of this fund.

It was revealed in the hearings that the Department is requiring a much less substantial contribution from the prairie States in connection with the shelterbelt than it requires from other States in which this work is carried on. Here again the committee feels that there is unwarranted discrimination in favor of the shelterbelt States as opposed to the other States and that it is a matter which the Department should rectify.

I presume that this unusual language was included in the report with the thought that the Department administering the act would take it as a direction not to spend the amount allocated on the shelterbelt project, but to dis-

tribute it among the various States in some other way. In that connection it might be pointed out that a distribution of \$300,000 among the 48 States for farm forestry would be a most impractical and wasteful procedure. Neither the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, or the Bureau of the Budget has prepared, approved, or submitted any proposal along that line, and certainly no responsible departmental head would sponsor such a wasteful and unjustified proposal. If the purpose is to kill the shelterbelt project, then it seems to me that it would have been wiser to have eliminated the appropriation altogether rather than to make the suggestion for its expenditure as is contained in the report.

I want at this time to call attention to some of the statements contained in the report and to point out that they cannot be justified by any facts shown in the records of the committee or of this Congress. Take, for instance, the statement:

It is believed that the Norris-Doxey Act was passed by Congress with the thought in mind that the appropriations to implement it should be allotted among the several States in some equitable ratio, such as one based upon the total farm acreage in each of such States adapted to forestry.

I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture when it reported the Norris-Doxey bill. I was present in the House when the bill was considered. To refresh my recollection, I have read the debate in the House on the bill and have reread the report from the Agricultural Committee and have also carefully reread the bill. There is nothing whatever in the bill, in the committee report, or in the discussion in the House which would in any way justify a belief that the Norris-Doxey Act was passed with the idea that the appropriations made under it should be allotted among the various States on the basis of some mathematical ratio. If it had been the intention in the act that funds should be allotted to the States on some such basis, certainly the bill would have set out that fact and the formula for making the allotments would have been set up in the bill itself. I challenge anyone to point out anything in the bill, the committee report, or the debates in the House and Senate which would justify any such assumption as is contained in the committee report.

I challenge, also, the statement contained in the committee report:

That the Department is requiring a much less substantial contribution in connection with the shelterbelt than it requires from other States where this work is carried on.

Under the Norris-Doxey Act it is not required that the States or even individuals make any contribution to match Federal funds, the only requirement being that "no cooperative reforestation or afforestation shall be undertaken pursuant to this act unless the cooperator makes available without charge the land to be planted." However, it has been the policy of the Forest Service to require contributions on the part of those on whose land shelterbelt plantings were

made. It should be recalled, however, that until the present fiscal year no direct Federal appropriations were made for carrying out the shelterbelt program. All of the Federal money which has been expended has been W. P. A. money, expended by the States in an effort to solve unemployment, which money undoubtedly would have been spent on other projects than the shelterbelt had not that program been in operation.

I have asked the Forest Service to furnish me the amount of the total project expenditures as compared with the money or other contributions furnished by farmers, municipalities, counties, and individuals in the way of cooperation. I have been furnished with these figures. For 1940 the total project expenditures were \$2,198,641 and the value of the cooperation by farmers, municipalities, counties, and individuals was \$1,133,875. For 1941 the corresponding figures were \$2,070,037 and \$1,184,827. Most of these contributions were made by the farmers themselves.

It will be seen, therefore, that notwithstanding the fact that no contribution is required of cooperators under the Norris-Doxey Act, very substantial contributions have been made by the cooperators, and furthermore that not only is it true that substantial contributions have been made by the cooperators, but no direct expenditures have been made by the Federal Government on the project until the present fiscal year. Therefore, any statement that a less substantial contribution is required of this project than others is not borne out by the facts.

I think it should also be pointed out that under the Norris-Doxey Act cooperation with individuals is provided for specifically in contrast with the provisions of some other acts providing only for cooperation by the State or State agencies. In fact, it might well be said that the principal purpose of the act was to set up a program whereby there should be direct cooperation between the Federal Government and the individual farmer.

Furthermore, it was contemplated at the time of the passage of the Norris-Doxey Act that the Prairie States forestry project was one of the projects under which funds would be spent. If you will refer to the letter of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture reporting on the bill, which is set out in the report, it will be noted that this project was referred to in some detail. Furthermore, the discussion of the Norris-Doxey Act shows clearly that this project was contemplated.

I would like also at this time to refer to the statement which has frequently been made in the Committee on Appropriations and here in the House that Congress ordered the liquidation of the shelterbelt project. It is true that the 1937 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, passed by Congress in 1936, contained an appropriation of \$170,000 for liquidation of the project. That money was never expended. Whatever the intention of the committee or of Congress may have been at that time is of no moment now because at least twice since that time both Houses of Congress

have approved of the shelterbelt project; first, in the passage of the Norris-Doxey Act; and second, in the passage of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1942, where an appropriation of \$300,000 was voted upon separately in the Senate where it was offered as an amendment from the floor and here in the House on a motion to instruct the conferees to accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any governmental project which has been more misrepresented and more misunderstood than the shelterbelt project. In the beginning many professed to treat it as a joke. It had the united opposition of the nurserymen of the country who were so shortsighted that they failed to see that a successful project of this kind would greatly stimulate the nursery business. It is my understanding that the nurserymen of this country have changed their minds on the matter and now realize that the success of this project has given a great impetus to the nursery business in the Prairie States.

This project was begun frankly as an experiment. There was little to go by in the way of experience. It has become one of the most successful afforestation projects ever undertaken in all of the history of mankind. During its early years it was handicapped by the fact that climatic and weather conditions were the worst in the history of the Great Plains. It would have been no discredit if due to those adverse weather conditions the project had failed. However, the project did not fail. It has been a tremendous success. I wish that every Member of this House had the opportunity to visit a shelterbelt planting. Some of you have done so, and I know the wonder and amazement with which you have viewed the results so far achieved. Its success is a tribute to the ability, efficiency, and training, as well as the vision, of the men comprising the Forest Service of the United States. It is my understanding that the project is now about to be taken over by the Soil Conservation Service, and I feel sure that under that management it will continue to be the success that it has been up to date. I am told that a large part of the personnel who have been conducting the project for the Forest Service will be taken over by the Soil Conservation Service. This insures a continuity of experience and management.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this bill in the Committee of the Whole may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why not include all Members?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request in accordance with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to secure that permission in the House.

Mr. TARVER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I restrict my request to what I originally presented: That all Members who have

spoken on the bill in the Committee of the Whole may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-914), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of books, law-books, books of reference, directories, and periodicals; not to exceed \$300 for newspapers; financial and credit reports, \$4,013,798.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 87, line 24, strike out "\$4,013,798" and insert "\$3,750,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the necessary reduction of the activities of the R. E. A. and the very considerable reduction in the amount of funds which will be available for the next fiscal year, our subcommittee has decided after conference with each other and with the gentleman from Illinois that we would be willing to accept this amendment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] originally proposed a very much larger reduction, but we have agreed to accept the present amendment if it meets with the approval of the committee.

* The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Rural Electrification Administration, \$4,013,798.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FADDIS: Page 88, line 18, strike out the period at the end of the line, insert a comma and add the following: "Provided, That during the period of the war in which the United States is now engaged, no part of this money appropriated under this bill shall be expended for administrative services which have to do with the construction of any facilities for the production or transmission of electric power in any area now receiving central station service."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

As a matter of fact, the Rural Electrification Administration does not build these lines. That is done by the Co-operative Power Association. To attempt to restrict the funds for the ad-

ministration of the Rural Electrification Administration here in Washington would certainly not be germane because it could not apply to restricting the Co-operative Association as to what it shall do with the funds it has borrowed, not the funds provided for administration but the funds provided for in the \$10,000,000 above and other funds that have been provided through the R. F. C.

So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is entirely out of order and, as I said, it is not germane; besides, it is legislation on an appropriation bill that cannot possibly reach the object to which it is directed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] desire to be heard?

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I contend this is not legislation upon an appropriation bill. It is a restriction of the way in which these funds may be spent, therefore a restriction upon the amount.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] states that this is a restriction upon the operation of the administrative branch of the Rural Electrification Administration here in Washington. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the object of this amendment is to prevent it from building lines in competition with lines already built and in support of that I want to read to the chairman section 2, or a part of section 2 of the act:

The Administrator is authorized and empowered to make loans for rural electrification and the furnishing of electric energy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment does not simply apply to rural electrification. The gentleman's amendment applies to everything appropriated in the bill.

Mr. FADDIS. It applies to the administrative expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The language of the amendment reads:

No part of this money appropriated under this bill shall be expended—

And so forth.

The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order, unless the gentleman has something further to offer.

The Chair is of the opinion that since the amendment is directed to the entire bill, it is not germane to this paragraph and therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FADDIS: Page 88, line 18, after the period at the end of the line, insert a comma and the following: "Provided, That during the period of the war in which the United States is now engaged, no part of this money shall be expended for administrative services which have to do with the construction of any facilities for the production or transmission of electric power in any area now receiving central station service."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against this amendment, and also the further point of order that it attempts to change existing law.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the duties of the Rural Electrification Administration are already prescribed in existing law. This amendment attempts to change that, which makes it purely legislation on an appropriation bill. Besides, as I pointed out a moment ago, this expense account has nothing whatever to do with the disposition of the money borrowed by the rural electrification cooperatives from the R. F. C. or through the R. F. C. This amendment is not in order for those three reasons.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I offer an observation in connection with this argument? The limitation which the gentleman seeks to impose upon the administrative expenses cannot be germane to this paragraph of the bill, which has nothing to do with administrative expenses but merely with the item of loans. The item of administrative expenses has already been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would call attention to the fact that the amendment is offered to the total amount for rural electrification, which includes everything for rural electrification.

Mr. TABER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. No; not at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] desire to be heard? The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I believe to be germane to the portion of the bill to which it is offered because it is offered as a limitation upon the administrative expenses connected with the administration of rural electrification without which administration they cannot borrow the money from the R. F. C. to construct lines. I contend that it is part of the administrative function of the R. E. A. to borrow money to construct lines, therefore an amendment offered to the administrative expenses of this bill is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which reads as follows:

Page 88, line —, after the period at the end of the line, insert a comma and the following: "Provided, That during the period of the war in which the United States is now engaged no part of this money shall be expended for administrative service which has to do with the construction of any facilities for the production or transmission of electric power in the area now receiving central station service."

The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order it is not germane. The Chair feels that the present amendment as distinguished from the former amendment, being limited to the amount proposed to be appropriated for the Rural Electrification Administration, and being a limitation only upon the expenditure of those funds, is in order; therefore, the point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], is recognized.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated many times during the con-

sideration of this bill, we are at war and because we are at war and because of the excessive use of copper at this time, copper has become a metal of the very highest strategic importance.

All I seek to do by this amendment is to prevent the R. E. A. from constructing lines to transmit power which duplicate already existing lines. I submit that in so doing I am only being consistent as regards the very wording of the law which gave the R. E. A. birth.

Section 2 of Public, No. 605, Seventy-fourth Congress, says in part:

The Administrator is authorized and empowered to make loans for rural electrification and the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central-station service.

Reference to the legislative history in connection with the enactment of this act and examination of the debates at that time disclose among the statements of its strongest supporters the following from Senator NORRIS:

There is no intention of going into a farming community which is already supplied with electric current and forming farm organizations there and having them built up to go into competition with farmers who are already getting their current from a central station.

Speaker RAYBURN, at that time chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, said this:

This organization, like the present temporary one, would finance projects in virgin territory only.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sanford M. Stoddard, for the Associate Solicitor, Rural Electrification Division, stated this in a letter:

Section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 limits the loan-making power of the administrator to the making of loans for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of facilities "for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central-station service." This, by implication, prohibits the making of loans to finance the construction of facilities to serve persons who are already receiving central-station service. Moreover, it evidences a congressional intent to set up a safeguard against Federal funds being used by the Rural Electrification Administration to finance the construction of facilities to compete with or duplicate existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, all I seek to do by this amendment is to provide that during the time of this emergency copper will not be wasted in constructing lines to transmit power where lines are already constructed for that purpose. As I have stated before, copper is a metal of the very highest strategic importance, and I certainly do not believe that at a time like this, regardless of what beliefs anyone may have about the R. E. A., we should allow the R. E. A. to continue its duplication of already existing lines to the detriment of national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that we might be able to get by this paragraph of the bill without reopening this perennial row between the advocates of public power and the advocates of private power.

Certainly there is no excuse for having a row about this section of the bill. The amount of the appropriation contained in the paragraph is very small in comparison with that carried in previous years, \$10,000,000 as against \$100,000,000 for the present fiscal year, although there will be carried over about \$20,000,000 in addition to that, making about \$30,000,000 available for the next fiscal year, which Mr. Slattery himself has testified would be sufficient.

There is no reason, therefore, that anybody should offer an amendment to increase the amount, and, in my judgment, no reason why anybody should undertake to decrease it.

As far as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is concerned, it evidently has relation to his subcommittee's investigation of the case in Arkansas, where his subcommittee report claims that copper was wasted by an R. E. A. cooperative and that a private power company could have built the line with less copper, and so forth, and so on. Our subcommittee, conceiving it to be a matter within its jurisdiction, made a thorough investigation of that Arkansas case. You will find the evidence with relation to it in the hearings. We were not able to determine that there had been any abuse of discretion on the part of the officials of the R. E. A. The defense officials of the Government seemed to feel that the R. E. A. had performed a very great public service in acceding to their desire to build the line in question, and that they did it with the use of less copper and furnished more power for the purposes desired by the defense authorities than would have been the case had the line been constructed by the private power company.

All that I think is neither here nor there. Here you are asked to put into the bill a limitation that would prevent the War Production Board from calling on an R. E. A. cooperative and asking that R. E. A. cooperative to do something for it that in its judgment would aid in the defense effort, as was true in the Arkansas case.

For what reason would you want to handicap the War Production Board in making use of any or all of the facilities of this country that may exist for the building of power lines or the furnishing of power to any defense industry or defense activity?

No matter how you feel on this public power versus private power question, there certainly is no justification for putting this limitation in the bill. I hold no brief either for or against power companies. I think power companies ought to be treated fairly. Their stocks are owned by citizens, and those citizens are entitled to fair treatment. I also think R. E. A. is doing a good job. But there is no reason for messing up this agricultural appropriation bill by a limitation of this kind, that is simply the outcome of a bitter fight over the Arkansas case, and handicapping our defense authorities in the way that is here proposed.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Georgia is on the committee that investigated the Arkansas case. That matter will be disposed of before this money is available, will it not? This could not apply to that at all.

Mr. TARVER. Undoubtedly so. I assume the gentleman wants to stop such practices for the next fiscal year. I do not think the House ought to enter judgment on the Arkansas case because I do not think it is a matter we can properly determine here at this time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. May I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the \$10,000,000 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized to lend this year was for defense projects only.

Mr. TARVER. Undoubtedly the limitation here would handicap the War Production Board and other defense authorities endeavoring to use, to the extent that they can do so, the service of the R. E. A. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

SEVERAL MEMBERS ROSE.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this amendment can serve no useful purpose. It can only tend to handicap the Rural Electrification Administration and the national defense efforts at this time.

In this connection let me say that this will not apply to the district I represent, for the reason that we have no private power companies in the district, but it will apply to a great many areas where it is absolutely necessary that these lines be built or that stand-by facilities be provided.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] attempts to leave the impression that the R. E. A. is hoarding or wasting copper that should be used for other purposes. I most emphatically deny that charge. That question was thoroughly investigated by the Appropriations Committee, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has just told you, and they found that no such condition prevails. On the other hand, certain private power interests have been hoarding copper, packing it in their warehouses and then demanding that the R. E. A. be denied the use of the copper necessary to carry on its work and to meet the defense efforts.

You are passing a bill for the American farmers. So far as the farmers are concerned, the people who till the soil, this Rural Electrification has done more for them in the last 5 years than has all the rest of the Department of Agricul-

ture. You only have one-third of the farms of this Nation electrified now. The rest of the farmers are pleading for it. It is necessary to enable them to meet the war demands. Yet you come here and go far beyond anything in the original law which prohibited the serving of individual homes that were already served from a central station. By this amendment you try to shut them out of the entire area and say to the farmer that if that area has been preempted by a private power company, then we shut the door in their faces so far as Rural Electrification is concerned.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that when these rural lines are taken to the homes and given to the farmers, they themselves pay for the installation in their properties.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. They pay for the wiring of their homes and for the installation of the facilities in their houses and out of the rates they pay, they ultimately amortize every dollar that is advanced for the building of these lines.

The Government of the United States will not lose a dollar, the Government of the United States will not lose a penny, but, on the other hand, it is building the morale of the American farmers. Why, did you know that the countries we are now fighting have been building these rural power lines for years? From 90 to 98 percent of the farmers in Germany, France, Norway, Sweden, Italy, and even Japan have been receiving the benefits of electricity for more than 7 years, when all we have done through our rural electrification program has been to electrify about one-third of the farm homes of the Nation.

This is nothing in God's world but the old attempt to paralyze rural electrification. It is an insidious movement of the enemies of R. E. A. to try to block rural electrification now. They talk about not wanting to build competing lines. The private power companies have gone into the areas where the R. E. A. cooperatives were building these lines and have built spite lines until the farmers took their shotguns and ran them out.

By all means, this amendment should be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], a member of the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I only want a minute. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question if I may have the attention of the author of the amendment. I am just a little confused about the meaning of the amendment, and for the purpose of its interpretation in case it should be adopted I would like to have the opinion of the gentleman.

I have in mind a national defense project, an ordnance project of considerable

importance, that is now being constructed, the power for which it has been expected would be supplied by R. E. A. In order to reach that point they go by a little town where there is an inadequacy of service now for the houses that will be needed there because of the construction of the ordnance proposition a few miles away.

It has been presumed that if the organization served the plant it might also go into this town. The utilities there are not in position to expand their own facilities. Does the gentleman think his amendment would preclude such a solution of the problem?

Mr. FADDIS. No; I do not, because obviously the small utility at this time serving that locality is not furnishing enough electricity to satisfy the demand and it would not apply in a case of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and likewise I am willing to admit the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] in discussing this question go to such extremes, one on one side and one on the other, that it is never possible to discuss the matter calmly. I happen to be a member of the majority of the committee that investigated the R. E. A. situation in Arkansas and Texas. We spent a great deal of time on that question, and did a mighty good job. We did determine that there was waste of strategic and critical material and there never has been any denial of that. As a matter of fact the explanation that comes from the War Production Board is that the project they approved consumed only 200 tons more copper than the one we said should have been approved. That much copper is of primary importance to our defense program. This Nation has always been a copper-exporting Nation; however, we are now a copper-importing nation. We have contracted for all of the surplus ore of South America in an attempt to bring it to the United States for smelting. That ore will run about 30 percent copper, because it is concentrated before shipment. At that rate 600 pounds of copper will require a ton of shipping. One third of our present requirements is coming from South America. The shortage of ships makes the transportation of that copper most difficult. Two hundred tons of copper is a very material amount, as you will agree, when you know that one type of bombing plane requires 500 pounds of copper and another type requires 2 miles of copper wire to keep it flying. Everytime a battleship slides down the ways it means that 2,000,000 pounds of copper is going to sea. Every pound of copper diverted from the war program means a soldier some place will not have the ammunition and supplies which he needs.

Of course, they now bring in the statement that the project was to furnish an additional amount of power, but that never appeared in our committee. That is something that has been raised since in an attempt to justify the waste. What we are trying to do is conserve strategic material. There is no question here

about stopping the R. E. A. program. The true friend of the farmer who examines into what has been going on in these cases will find that these co-ops have used bonds that are the obligation of the farmers to build plants and lines to serve defense installations which will be idle after the war, and the farmers will be left without any return and the obligation to pay.

We have heard much during the past few weeks of blocs. Sometimes it is the labor bloc and sometimes it is the farm bloc, or some other bloc. It is high time that we all get together and form the United States bloc. It is time for all of us to forget the special interest or the special advantage of any isolated portion of the population and devote our talents and our efforts to the welfare of the Nation. It has been interesting to note the number of Members who were strong in their support of the provision to suspend the 40-hour week who have been ardent in their objection to any reduction in any portion of this agriculture appropriation bill. On the 40-hour suspension they contended with force, and with logic, that you cannot fight and win a war while working but 40 hours a week. Many of those same gentlemen are equally forceful, but far less logical, in their contention that all of the services, subsidies, programs, and benefits accorded the farmer in time of peace shall continue during time of war.

These gentlemen think they are sustaining the best interests of the farmer. They are sincere in that belief. Let me warn you now you are doing your farmer friends no service in this regard. The best service you can render now is frankly and conscientiously to admit that you cannot have this war effort and all of these other benefits at the same time. Those who are interested in labor, in the farmer, in the underprivileged, or any of the other objects and beneficiaries of these programs, can best serve the group in which interested by assisting in a sensible program of retrenchment. Take this bill and, in good faith, remove therefrom the items which can be removed with the least damage to the program. There is not a man on this floor who does not know that the departments are crowded with unnecessary employees. They will be eliminated when you cut the appropriation to the point that the department heads must eliminate them. That will result in their transfer to war work. You know as well as I do that even minor employees of all of the departments travel at Government expense on the slightest pretext. Yet you continue to refuse to cut the items contained in the bill for travel expense. The reduction or elimination of these administrative items will do slight, if any, damage to the beneficial objectives which you seek. You just insist upon maintaining these programs without amendment or drastic retrenchment and you are going to find that the people of this country will rise up in time, and that time is not far distant, and repeal the whole program. You friends of the farm program, and the friends of other programs for that matter, had better get busy and make those reductions yourselves. If

you do not do it with friendly and sympathetic interest in the program, the enemies of those programs will surely get the upper hand and do the job. When the enemies do the job they will leave nothing of it. You friends can, if you will, reduce these appropriations where they will do the least harm. It is ridiculous to see friends of the farmer take days here in insisting that yearbooks shall be issued in time of war, that information service shall not be curtailed, and that the myriad of inspectors and agents shall be continued. You cannot win a war like that. The people know that you cannot win a war like that. They are not going to stand for this Congress acting as if you can win a war like that. You descendants of those who sustained the Union, and you descendants of those who sustained the Confederacy should call upon your ancestors for advice. Those ancestors will tell you that the kind of war in which you are now engaged takes all of your resources. They, on both sides, felt the actual pangs of hunger. They wore rags and tatters. They gave their all for a war effort. Since that great struggle we have seen no such war until our entrance into this one.

Every selfish interest must be abandoned. Groups must cease trying to get an advantage over each other. That applies to everybody. Publicly owned electric power and privately owned electric power must cease their attempts to secure advantages to be enjoyed after the conflict, and waste sorely needed strategic or critical material in the effort. No patriotic man or woman should hesitate to forego an advantage. Where did you get the idea that all of the sacrifices of war is to be borne by those who enter the Army? Why should they be called upon to suffer inconvenience, financial disaster, bloodshed, and death, while others give up nothing, not even social gains, limitation upon hours of labor, farm parity, or profits? During their absence, their parents are not going to accept such a notion with complacency. Those who are risking all are not going to forget such an attitude. They will remember it when they get back and there will be just retribution.

Your mail and mine reflects great concern, doubt, and unrest throughout the country. That mail comes from men and women who know what war means. It comes from mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, wives, and sweethearts of men from whom they have not heard in weeks. All they know is that their loved ones have sailed for foreign duty. To do what? Enjoy the benefits of a new economic order? Oh no; to sweat, to toil, to bleed, and to die. To sustain him in that effort he needs to know that his loved ones are wholeheartedly behind him. And those left at home must feel that their Government is fully sensible of the needs of this situation. You worry about this unrest as I do. Then why not do something toward ending it. Get down to work and cut out these appropriations which are not needed. Put everybody to work every available hour and keep them working. Put a stop to strikes. Put a stop to excessive war

profits. Put a stop to reckless spending. When you do those things you are rendering a patriotic service to your Nation and to all of the people, laborers, farmers, businessmen, soldiers, sailors, and marines, and you are doing no one an injustice.

It was interesting to hear members of this appropriation subcommittee contend that amendments should not be offered from the floor to cut items in this bill. They take the position that the men who have brought this bill to the floor have had years of experience in preparing the bill and in placing the items in it. Frankly, that is just the trouble with all of these bills. By that I mean no reflection upon those gentlemen. The point is that these items have been carried from year to year for such a period of time that few remember the exact reason they were placed in the bill in the first place. In other words, as a Congress and a Nation we are in the position of a person who goes along from year to year feeling that he cannot do without any of the things he regards necessary to life. It just does not seem possible to cut personal expenses. The pay check goes each month and nothing is left and still there is no expenditure that he can eliminate. Did you ever have the experience of losing your job? It was remarkable the number of things you could do without. You never thought you could live on so much less. Things formerly regarded as essential became unnecessary luxuries. That is the situation in which this Nation now finds itself and we had better admit it. There has been a terrible change in our position. We are faced by a condition as vital and critical as that which faces the man who suddenly finds himself without an income for himself and family. As a Nation we must do just what that man would do. That is, we must do without many things we thought indispensable. Let us get down to doing it. Not only in the case of the farmer, but in the case of everybody except the soldiers, sailors, and marines and their arms and equipment. This bill is before us now, let us go to work on it and keep up the work throughout.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] is a very good amendment, and if the members of this Committee will carefully read the amendment and understand what is in it, they will see that this does not do anything to the R. E. A., and I for one do not want to do anything to the R. E. A. This amendment limits the R. E. A. from going into competition with private industry, where private industry is sufficiently filling the bill and furnishing the power in that particular place. I have in my pocket a map of the Arkansas-Louisiana district in which they are running lines, and they have applications before the Public Corporation Commission of Kansas, and also before the commission in the State of Missouri to run lines directly parallel with the lines now serving and that are serving rural cooperators in my district, and they had their hear-

ings set up until after next May, after this report of the committee came out, and they are going to try to do that. They have bought 675 poles and they have them on the ground, and 10,000 insulators, and other equipment except the copper conductor wire lying down there in violation of the law, right this minute. This amendment should be adopted to stop that practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague and good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] stated a moment ago that his committee had not known until after they closed their hearings that the proposal submitted by the R. E. A. would bring more power into Arkansas than the proposal submitted by private utilities.

Mr. KILDAY. I did not state that. I stated that the contention was never made by the people who contended for the other project. And another thing—

Mr. POAGE. No; not another thing, because I have only 2 minutes. The gentleman now says that the contention was not made by those who represented the R. E. A. The committee never called a single witness from the R. E. A., nor a single witness from any of the local cooperatives. They had witnesses from the private utilities, but not one single witness was ever called by that committee from any of the local cooperatives, and if they can name a man that they called representing the R. E. A. or the local cooperatives, then I will apologize to them here and now. Name one man that you called from the R. E. A.

Mr. FADDIS. Whose witness was the gentleman?

Mr. POAGE. You did not call me.

Mr. ELLIS. And they did not call me, either.

Mr. POAGE. You did not call either one of us. My colleague [Mr. KILDAY] was very kind and fair and notified me of the hearing, but I gathered the distinct impression when I appeared before your committee, at my own request, that you did not want to hear me. Several times you called attention to the fact that you were not interested in knowing why certain lines were built but only in how much copper was wasted. You assumed that all the copper used was wasted and did not want to be shown anything to the contrary.

You did not call either Mr. ELLIS or me and neither one of us represented either the R. E. A. or any local cooperative. You purported to find what the books of these local cooperatives showed and yet you did not have a single witness who had ever seen the books. I am afraid that if your amendment were adopted, it might be administered through power company injunctions with the same lack of consideration for the rights of the R. E. A. that your hearing was conducted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLIS to the Faddis amendment: After the word "proceeding," insert the word "adequate."

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment and will be glad to do so.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, just in case the Faddis amendment should be adopted—I do not think it should be and I do not think it even does what the gentleman would like to do to the R. E. A., or what he hopes to do to the R. E. A.—but, just in case it should be adopted, then certainly you would want the word "adequate" in there or else you would forever preclude the R. E. A. from building lines anywhere where there was even a tiny, small bit of electric power in the community.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The instance cited by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], if the production of that utility was adequate or inadequate, they could not build a line in there?

Mr. ELLIS. Right. Even if a small servicing line happened to go out into a community to a private home, then no transmission line could be built into the community.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Just as this fiasco which the Arkansas Power & Light has been trying to perpetrate.

Mr. ELLIS. That is right.

The situation in my State has been mentioned. That was a case where the R. E. A. was building a transmission line out into a rural area that was not being served by a private power company. The plant is in Mr. NORRELL's district. He is on the floor. They are building a big aluminum plant out in a wooded area that did not have central-station service, and the very amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] is proposing would not remedy anything he was talking about. I hope you will add my amendment to his and then kill it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, the Faddis amendment ought to be defeated. It does not add anything to the war program. It hurts a program important to many sections and many people. They cannot get the copper to build any essential lines anyway, as there are priority boards here in Washington. If you have not found that out, I have. They decide whether anyone can have the copper or not.

It is just a part of the old utility game to run out a spite line. I have lived on a farm for years without electric power. I have lived on a farm by the year with electric power and I know how much it adds to country life. I know of no greater wrong than that was ever done to the farm people than by the utilities running out their little spite lines all over the country

to prevent the R. E. A. from giving the country the electric service they needed. [Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FADDIS) there were ayes 49 and noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in 1942 the Rural Electrification Administration had funds available in the sum of \$100,000,000 for R. E. A. loans together with a sum of \$4,262,375 for administrative expenses.

For the fiscal year 1943 the committee has reported \$10,000,000 for loans and the sum of \$4,013,798 for administrative expenses. If one adds the \$20,000,000 of unused funds for the R. E. A. now available for loans, it will mean that it will have available in 1943 13 percent for administrative expenses as against 4.2 percent in 1942.

The amount reported by the subcommittee is identical with the Budget estimate. Available loans were cut by 90 percent.

Administrative expenses were cut by only 5 percent. I am, therefore, of the opinion that the amount of administrative expenses should be further reduced. I am not insensible to the fact that the R. E. A. has an accumulation of work as a result of loans made in other years but I feel notwithstanding that fact that a further administrative cut should be made and I am glad that the chairman of the subcommittee has acceded to my suggestion for a further cut of \$250,000.

The hearings as well as the committee report will indicate that for several years I have given close attention to the R. E. A. not because I am opposed to public power but because I will not countenance in any agency of the Government deception and misleading information.

When the agricultural appropriation bill for 1941 was reported to the House on the 3d of March 1941 the committee report devoted more than a page to the matter of "integrity of sources of information of committees of Congress" as a result of an investigation which I made.

At that time I discovered in a report which was submitted to me by the R. E. A. that the number of persons who have received administrative within-grade promotions was not complete and accurate. I discovered, also, that a large number of employees had actually received as much as three steps of promotion whose

names were entirely omitted from the report made to me by the R. E. A.

When this letter was submitted to the attention of the subcommittee the committee at once recognized the gravity of this matter, because the committee understood full well the importance of accurate information coming from the various agencies of government to the Committee on Appropriations.

In the committee report which accompanied the 1941 bill the subcommittee said:

This regrettable series of incidents involving as it does the integrity of a source on which the Congress and its committee must draw for information desired in the formulation of policy-making legislation is of such grave importance that the committee believes it should be called to the attention of the House, and is, therefore, presenting it in this report.

I was far from satisfied with the disposition of the matter and thereupon requested the Secretary of Agriculture to make a complete investigation of the whole matter. The Secretary's investigators performed a diligent and forthright piece of work in consequence of which the Secretary of Agriculture made a report to the subcommittee on November 15, 1941.

In that report he made the following statement:

At the outset, let me say that the investigation fully supported Mr. DIRKSEN's contention that the promotion figures submitted by the Rural Electrification Administration to the Director of Personnel of this Department, which formed the basis of the Director's report to Mr. DIRKSEN, were inaccurate and incomplete. The investigation further revealed that equally inaccurate and incomplete promotion figures were submitted by the Rural Electrification Administration to the Bureau of the Budget.

Disciplinary action has been taken by the Department. In the case of Robert B. Craig, Assistant Administrator, the Secretary reports that—

A severe letter of reprimand and warning has been addressed to Mr. Craig.

In the case of Mr. Kendall Foss, Chief of the Information Division of Rural Electrification Administration, the Secretary states that—

At the very outset, he invented a scheme designed to thwart the submission of complete information that had been requested. * * * Charges looking to his removal from the service have been preferred against Mr. Foss.

In a subsequent report to the committee, dated February 9, 1942, the Secretary states:

I have signed a decision finding that the charges are sustained and removing Mr. Foss from his position in this Department effective at the termination of his last day of service January 30, 1942.

In the case of Mr. W. Lyle Sturtevant, budget officer of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Secretary's report states:

Mr. Sturtevant has been severely reprimanded and his suspension from duty without pay for a period of 30 days has been ordered.

The Secretary further advised the committee that—

The foregoing information came as a distinct shock to me and you may be sure that the Department will not tolerate the submission of false or misleading information to any committee of Congress or any Member thereof.

The Secretary is to be commended for expeditious, forthright, and resolute disposition of this regrettable matter.

In a subsequent letter dated February 27, 1942, the Secretary said:

I felt that the evidence did justify a finding that Mr. Craig, as Assistant Administrator, had not employed diligence and care commensurate with the responsibility of his office in supervising the compilation of the information in the communications to the committee with respect thereto. I, therefore, took the disciplinary action with which you are familiar.

The whole matter is rather completely set forth in volume 2 of the printed hearings on the appropriation bill for 1943, beginning on pages 448 and 755.

Notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Kendall Foss, who was Chief of the Information Division of Rural Electrification Administration, was finally dismissed, he is today employed in the Economic Defense Board. Truly it is strange and puzzling that an employee discharged for devising and inventing a scheme to thwart the submission of complete information to a committee of Congress should be acceptable to another agency in the executive branch of the Government which also operates on public funds.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 5 percent of the foregoing amounts for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any bureau, division, or office herein provided for shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects included within the general expenses of such bureau, division, or office, but no more than 5 percent shall be added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of extraordinary emergency.

Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That such vehicles shall be used only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of motortrucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the limitation on expenditures for purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles in the field service shall be interchangeable between the various bureaus and offices of the Department, to such extent as the exigencies of the service may require: *Provided further*, That appropriations contained in this act shall be available for the maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may exchange motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, tractors, road equipment, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats purchased by him: *Provided further*, That the funds available to the Agricultural Adjust-

ment Administration may be used during the fiscal year for which appropriations are herein made for the maintenance, repair, and operation of one passenger-carrying vehicle for official purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], who was also on the Military Appropriations Subcommittee, what effect the provision which was carried in the civil-functions War Department bill will have upon this paragraph.

Mr. COLLINS. The civil-functions War Department bill carries the following section:

That no part of any money appropriated by this act or any other act except the appropriation "Contingent Expenses, Executive Office," and acts making appropriations for the military and naval establishments, shall be used for the purchase or exchange of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle if such purchase or exchange interferes with the priorities or quota for military or naval purposes as determined, respectively, by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

This amendment, I may say to the gentleman from New York, is applicable to the pending appropriation bill as well as to all other appropriation bills for other departments and independent activities.

Mr. TABER. And no department outside the War and Navy Departments can get any money to buy automobiles unless it comes within the provisions of the priorities that may be set up by the Secretaries of War and Navy?

Mr. COLLINS. That is right, except the Executive Office of the White House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not entirely probable that the civil-functions War Department bill will be passed by the Senate and approved by the President before this bill? So it would affect this act also.

Mr. COLLINS. It would make no difference.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was not plain from the language.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question: I notice on page 526 of the hearings that there is only a decrease in the number of automobiles, passenger-carrying vehicles, of 18 between 1942 and 1943, out of a total of some 21,000 vehicles used by the Department of Agriculture. Is the country to understand that this is the only reduction to be practised by the Department of Agriculture when the people of the country are on notice that they have got to get along without any?

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will observe the copy of the bill as it was submitted in accordance with Budget recommendations, it contains provisions in connection with every Bureau's appropriation throughout the bill for a certain number of motor-propelled vehi-

cles. We eliminated all of those provisions. The only provision in the bill, therefore, with reference to passenger-carrying vehicles is that which has been quoted in the paragraph just read. We have gone through all of the numerous estimates to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. DONDERO. Then it is wrong to assume, as these figures would indicate, that the Department is going to have in 1943 within 18 cars the same number of vehicles it had in 1942?

Mr. TARVER. They are going to get along with a lot less than they estimated for, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. That is what I was asking for.

Mr. TARVER. They are going to find it very difficult to get the number of vehicles they think they need.

Mr. DONDERO. Exactly; and they should not be favored any more than the public.

[Here the gavel fell.]

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department of Agriculture as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 99, between lines 6 and 7, insert a new section numbered—

"Sec. 4. Not more than a total of \$8,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this act may be spent for travel expenses either by railroad, privately owned automobile, steamship, or airplane, including the per diem allowance for hotels, subsistence, or other incidental traveling expenses."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, my attention was inadvertently diverted from the reading of the amendment. Will the gentleman explain the purpose of his amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. My amendment seeks, Mr. Chairman, to limit the amount

that can be spent by the Department of Agriculture from funds appropriated in this bill to \$8,000,000 for travel.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, this is an over-all amendment. The word "over-all" perhaps sounds a little peculiar in a travel account for the Department of Agriculture. This amendment merely seeks to freeze into the Budget \$8,000,000 of excessive funds that can be saved the taxpayers of the Nation. If the Budget does not care to freeze it, perhaps the Senate can restrict the amounts individually and thus save \$8,000,000, or, as a very last resort, this \$8,000,000 that will be left loose in the bill may be spent on the farms of this country. Those are the three choices.

Perhaps I am a little bit picayunish in setting forth such small figures in these amendments, but I want the Members of the House to realize that in 16 States of the Nation they are paying in 1941 corporate and individual income taxes less than \$16,000,000. I do not believe that the individuals of these States who are paying their taxes will want to think that the entire collection from those States will be spent for bureaucratic travel alone. Furthermore, may I advise the Members of the House that the farmers themselves are smart? They know where this money is wasted. I have received but one out of four or five hundred letters protesting a reduction in this travel amount.

Legitimate objection was made to some of my amendments, that it would unduly curtail and restrict travel in certain specific instances. This amendment, if adopted, will allow the Department of Agriculture to budget its travel account where the need is greatest and to reduce it where the need is not at all great. It will provide a saving in this way and will provide that the agencies and bureaus that do travel may take the funds, and those who have been taking trips to conventions, going around and wasting money in all sorts of ways, may be cut out. Perhaps a greater amount may be given to departments like the Bureau of Dairy Industry, which, may I call to the attention of Members from the dairy States, spent less than \$9,000 in travel last year, while other departments spent up to a half-million dollars. It goes back to this one proposition: They can travel half as many, half as far, not half as often, or half as well, or, if they do not want to do that, they may reduce 12½ percent on each one of these items, and that will effect the saving we are trying to effect in this bill. It will not mean a 50-percent reduction, even if you limit it to \$8,000,000, because of other reductions that have been made in this bill. In fact, it will give them from 60 to 66½ percent of the travel account that was budgeted before Pearl Harbor for

use of the travel account of the Department of Agriculture.

The yardstick is very popular in this administration, and I believe it is a pretty good yardstick. I always like to go to the Post Office Department, because I find that that is one Department which functions 100-percent efficient.

You do not have a lot of extra or waste motion or a lot of extravagance. Would you gentlemen believe that the Post Office Department appropriations or budget, or the amount of money spent for travel in 1941, was less than one-third of the amount asked by the Department of Agriculture? The Post Office Department spent \$5,387,000 for travel. I would like to ask you which Department you think serves the greatest number of people or did the best job?

It will be argued that this will cripple the Department, but I want to point out that this will not affect the 20,000 Government-owned cars that are not touched by this travel appropriation bill. When you listen to the story that it will cripple the Department, ask yourselves how the automobile dealer in your home town feels; ask yourselves how the tire dealer in your home town feels; ask yourselves how the refrigerator dealer, how the typewriter dealer, and how the housewives, who are going without sugar today because of the war emergency, feel. Then tell them that you were afraid to cripple the activities of the bureaucrats down here in Washington by putting a 50-percent or a 66½-percent limit on their pre-Pearl Harbor expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment, which I do not believe, judging from previous action, the Committee of the Whole contemplates, will, of course, be very disastrous. To begin with you have already cut the administrative expenses of some organizations severely. You cut the administrative expenses in connection with the farm-tenant purchase program 50 percent. That included the travel item, salaries, and expenses. Now it is proposed to cut them 50 percent more. You cut the Bureau of Agricultural Economics \$1,000,000 which, of course, involved the travel item for that Bureau as well as other items of expense in connection with the Bureau. Now it is proposed to cut them 50 percent more. The same thing is true with reference to the Office of Information, which has some travel expenses in it, in which you have a reduction of one-third, from \$1,500,000 to \$1,000,000. Then you cut by \$25,000,000 the appropriation for grants and rural rehabilitation. Now the effect of this amendment would be to cut them by another 50 percent.

Those are only some of the instances in which the adoption of an amendment such as this would work disaster upon the Department of Agriculture. There are seven organizations of the Department of Agriculture that use 85 percent of the travel allowance. The Bureau of Animal Industry is one of them. If you

cut the travel allowance for the Bureau of Animal Industry half in two, of course that Bureau is not going to be able to continue efficiently its work in the eradication of Bang's disease, tuberculosis, and various diseases of animals with which it undertakes to deal.

The only sensible way to reduce the appropriation for travel expenses in the Bureau of Animal Industry or in any of the other bureaus, as pointed out by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the other day, would be to first reduce the personnel by whatever percentage you wanted to reduce the travel expense. If you wanted to reduce the travel expense 50 percent, cut the personnel 50 percent first, then cut travel expense 50 percent. It certainly would be foolish to cut the travel expense item 50 percent and leave the same number of personnel to be employed.

Then we have the Forest Service, a Service which is charged with the protection of a great deal of the most valuable of the forest area of the United States and for which a great amount of travel is necessary for adequate protection.

Do you want at one fell swoop, without any reason being assigned therefor except the desire of somebody to economize to cut by 50 percent the allowance of the Forest Service for travel? Can you not envision the very serious effect that that would have upon the operations of that Service for the next fiscal year?

I might go on with a discussion of the other seven of the organizations. There is the Farm Credit Administration, which has over \$1,000,000 of this travel allowance, which is used in connection with its manifold activities. There are the land banks, the production-credit associations, and other activities throughout the country in connection with the work of the Farm Credit Administration. You certainly do not want to undertake to hamper that service by cutting its appropriation for travel to 50 percent of what was felt necessary by the subcommittee which formulated this bill. The activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration would be similarly handicapped.

There is a reasonable way to effect economies. It ought to be based upon evidence; it ought to be based upon sound judgment as to where economies may be made without seriously hampering important governmental services. In my judgment, this is not the way to do it, and I hope the gentleman's amendment will be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the Monroney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 95, noes 65.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 99, after the period in line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay the salaries, allowances, or expenses of more than one Agricultural Adjustment Administration committeeman in each county committee and one township (community) committeeman in each township: *And provided further*, That salaries, expenses, and allowances of the county associations shall not be more than 2 percent of the benefits paid directly to farmers."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman. There are no funds carried in the bill to pay the salaries of county committeemen or community committeemen. The expenses of the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act are paid by the farmers themselves, or deducted from their benefits. The amendment offered by the gentleman, if adopted, would be absolutely nugatory and ineffective, and does not have any relation to any funds carried in the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JONES. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the benefits the farmers receive, from which the committeemen, county and community, are paid, are carried in this bill. It seems to me it makes no difference as to the germaneness of the amendment whether it takes a long while to get the money from these funds or whether they get them right now. It seems to me that by direction this is a limitation upon the amount of expenses that can be charged for the county and community committeemen and the entire personnel for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman point out anything in the bill that relates to the matter on which he is trying to place a limit?

Mr. JONES. Parity payments are carried in the bill. The section with regard to that covers the funds from which the county and community committeemen are paid. The sugar benefits, amounting to some \$40,000,000, are funds from which they are paid. The soil-conservation benefits carried in the bill are funds from which they are paid.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair permit me to be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. These committeemen are paid by the Government out of this appropriation, as I understand. There is an allotment made to the farmer of a certain amount figured in accordance with the Adjustment Act. Out of that allotment is taken the farmer's share of the committeemen's fees, and these fees are paid to the committeemen by the Government out of this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair correctly understand the gentleman from New York to say that the committeemen to whom this amendment relates are paid from funds carried in this bill?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, paid by the Government.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the additional point of order that the amendment is certainly not germane to the portion of the bill to which it is offered, which has no reference to the work of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is a limitation on all the funds appropriated in the pending bill. It appears to the Chair that it is simply a limitation upon those appropriations carried in the bill, and, therefore, the amendment is in order. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOOK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to cut down the amount of money taken out of the hides of farmers benefited by the A. A. A. crop-insurance program, parity-payment program, and sugar-benefit program. The county committee expenses, including the township committeemen, the clerical help, the office force, office rent, the mapping division, and travel expenses for township and county committee costs 5.8 percent of the benefits paid to the farmers. The Washington office of the A. A. A. and the field office of the A. A. A. cost another 2 percent, although this latter 2 percent for the Washington and field offices is not taken out of the farmers' checks. The total administration of A. A. A. is too high, and the figures show that the administrative cost is ballooned.

I now give you the break-down of the cost. County committeemen expenses chargeable to the benefits paid to farmers, as follows:

	Approximate
County committeemen.....	\$4,800,000
Community of township committeemen.....	4,600,000
Compliance division.....	11,900,000
Clerical, office force, office rent, including perimeter mapping division.....	18,000,000
Travel for county or township committeemen plus performance division.....	1,758,000
Actual total, as given by Agriculture Department.....	41,944,000

Under section 388 of the basic law, all or any part of the county, including township and community—associations' expenses may be charged to the farmers benefited. Under the figures for 1941, \$14,944,000 is 5.8 percent of the direct benefits paid to the farmers.

Section 392 provides that the D. C. and field expenses, salaries, etc., shall not exceed 3 percent of the appropriation for farm benefits. In this 3-percent limitation is included General Accounting Office expense of audit, and Treasury Department expense for writing the checks.

Under section 392 for the 1941 fiscal year 2 percent of the entire appropriation was used. In this 2 percent approximately \$500,000 went to the General Accounting Office and \$400,000 to the Treasury Department.

The payments direct to farmers are as follows:

A. C. P.	\$470,469,890
Parity	213,300,000
Sugar benefits	45,470,000

Total payment..... 729,169,890

By way of comparison, the Internal Revenue Bureau has a similar organization and a similar responsibility of collecting from and checking over the returns of the general public who has to deal with the Government. The entire cost of personnel for the fiscal year 1942 for the Internal Revenue Bureau is \$78,264,521. The number of personnel who earn this salary is 30,660 persons. The total amount collected in the fiscal year 1941 was \$12,198,665,000. Thus the Internal Revenue Bureau operates for two-thirds of 1 percent of the funds it deals with.

To give you some idea of the extent of the work done by the Internal Revenue Bureau throughout the country with individuals and corporations, the \$12,198,665,000 is represented by unemployment compensation, social-security taxes, income taxes, excess-profits taxes, liquor and tobacco taxes, and miscellaneous taxes.

Obviously, the difference between the operation of the Internal Revenue Bureau and the A. A. A. program is that the Internal Revenue Bureau considers everybody honest, and allows them to make out their own report without snooping until they find that the Government has been defrauded. The Agriculture Department deals with the farmers as though they were all crooks.

The purpose of my amendment is to cut the cost of administration to 4.1 percent of the benefits paid to the farmers—2.1 percent for Washington and field officers, and 2 percent for county and community committee organizations—which I think is ample, if the Agriculture Department puts the farmer on his honor as the Internal Revenue Bureau puts the people of the United States on their honor to report their income to the Government.

True, I have cut the number of committeemen but the big cuts will have to come from the technical staffs. Everybody knows there is money wasted in the operation. The administration costs too much. This amendment will do the job that should be done. I hope the committee will adopt my amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] or anybody else in my desire to see the county administrative expenses of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration reduced to as low a percentage of the benefits which they handle as may be possible. I certainly want the farmers of the country to receive, to the last penny they may receive after the payment of reasonable administrative expenses, every

dollar that is carried in this program. But if you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio you are going to wreck the farmer.

If you will examine the hearings of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for the last several years, you will find that we have not waited for the gentleman from Ohio to raise this question. We have had it up with the officials of the administration from time to time and have urged the bringing down of these administrative expenses in every possible way. They have been brought down. They are very much lower now than they were some 2 or 3 years ago. We conceive that the activities of our subcommittee may have had some influence in that direction. But you cannot put all of these counties in the United States, 3,000 or more in number, of an agricultural character, in the same category from the standpoint of administrative expense. You cannot put all of those in my congressional district in the same category. In the counties where the farms are small and few in number, and where a great deal of measuring has to be done in order to determine whether the farmers are within their quotas or not, the administrative expenses are necessarily much larger in proportion to the amount of benefits involved than they are in larger counties or in sections of the country where there are large farms that may be easily measured.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. I think it is quite desirable to reduce expenses wherever that can be done, but I have a county in my district where it is 135 miles from one side of the county to the other. The area of the county is about as large as the State of Connecticut. How could one man measure all the farms in that county to find out whether the farmers are in compliance or not?

Mr. TARVER. The amendment would wreck the farmers in the gentleman's county, and it would wreck the farmers in most of the counties of my congressional district because they could not get this work done. This was a new thing just a few years ago, and they had to set up the organization to carry out the program. It was not and is not perfect. They had to secure not only these committee men and field men to measure in the field, but a lot of other employees whose services were of a seasonal character, not necessary throughout the year, but only at certain times.

Adopt this amendment and in a great many counties of the United States, if not in most of them, we will not be able to measure these farmers' land and determine whether they are within the quotas assigned them for the various crops that are subject to quota, and instead of helping the farmer, this would do just the opposite.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Would the gentleman think that 4 percent, the amount the farmers receive, is not enough?

Mr. TARVER. I think in some counties it is too much, and in other counties too little. I think it depends on the nature of the work to be done. If you go into counties like some of mine, where the farms are small, and some times very hilly, it takes a good deal of time to measure the land in the field, to determine how much the man has in cotton. It takes as long a time to measure one little farm as it would to measure a 600-acre farm out in the country where the land is level, and where the cultivated land is all in one block. I am sure the gentleman's purpose is good, but I am sure his purpose if achieved would bring about the opposite of what he desires.

Mr. JONES. I submit that the photographing of all of the country has been done by the Agriculture Department, and all they have to do is to get a measuring stick out in their offices.

Mr. TARVER. But the farmers do not plant the same crops in one field every year. In my country they are rotating their crops. They will have one field in cotton one year, and the cotton will be in another field the next year. You have to measure those fields every year in order to determine whether they are within the quota.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 64, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

This act may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to express admiration for the able way in which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has handled this bill.

It is a difficult bill at any time, and particularly this year, not only because of the varied and extensive provisions of the bill itself, but because of the condition of the times and the circumstances under which it has been considered. Notwithstanding the obstacles encountered, the gentleman from Georgia has steered the bill with unfailing tact and courtesy and has displayed a generalship which is one of the outstanding features of this session of Congress.

The members of the subcommittee reporting the bill—including the membership from both sides of the aisle—have labored indefatigably. The hearings on the bill, beginning in November and continuing until late in February, exceed by

far, both in extent and duration, the time spent on any other appropriation bill this year. They are entitled to the thanks and commendation of the entire membership of the House. The bill is exceptional in another respect. It is the first bill ever reported by the Committee on Appropriations on which the beneficiaries—the farmers—speaking through their farm organizations, have requested a reduction in appropriations. They are to be congratulated on the passage of a bill under which—with the few adjustments to be made by the Senate—they can efficiently and adequately produce the food that will win the war and dictate the peace that follows the war.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. We have been 9 days in the consideration of this bill. It has taken much time and attention, and I believe that the Committee has given to it the very best that was in them in trying to solve the problems presented by the bill. At this time I feel it would be wrong if I did not call attention to the fine work that has been done here by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] throughout the long, hard debate which we have gone through. Many amendments have been involved, and for the men to keep track of those amendments as well as has been done and to cover the situation from the hearings and from other facts at their disposal has been a severe task.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make an announcement for the benefit of certain gentlemen who have talked with me at various times during the day concerning whether or not separate votes were to be requested on certain amendments.

At the time of my consultations with them I advised them that it was my purpose to ask for separate votes on certain amendments. Since that time, and in view of the hard work which has been done by the House and the lateness of the hour and the probability that the Senate will pretty thoroughly review everything that has been done by the House in connection with this bill, I have decided that as far as I am concerned I do not intend to ask for any roll call on these amendments or any separate vote on the amendments.

I make this announcement in order that other gentlemen may, if they see proper, request separate votes.

Mr. Chairman, I consider that everybody has been granted unanimous consent to revise and extend their remarks.

I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAMSPECK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under

consideration the bill H. R. 6709, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment involving loans, grants, and rehabilitation, which appears on page 83 of the bill—the so-called Dirksen amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them *eh grosse*.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 83, line 3, strike out "\$50,319,557" and insert "\$25,319,557."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 174 and noes 102.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (after counting). Twenty-seven Members have arisen, not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 72, line 2, strike out "\$20,510,812" and insert "\$10,510,812."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion by Mr. Tarver to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to correct totals in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] be allowed to extend the remarks he made on Tuesday by adding a paragraph.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article on Army Ordnance, by Colonel Barker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein a resolution by the United Mothers of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of today's business and other special orders I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a letter in the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a petition from 800 farmers in my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include figures given me by the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today in the Committee of the Whole, and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the Chicot Spectator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a speech made by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], on December 4, three days before Pearl Harbor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein, in the Appendix, a newspaper article which appeared in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and to extend the remarks I made on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, one to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial and the other to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday,

March 16, immediately after the address by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. DITTER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address delivered by myself last evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next it may be in order to consider individual bills on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE HONORABLE DUNHAM WRIGHT, OF MEDICAL SPRINGS, OREG.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, today all Oregon is greeting the honored centenarian, Dunham Wright. Grande Ronde Valley pioneers will be gathered at my home town, La Grande, tonight to celebrate, in his living presence, the hundredth birthday of a vigorous, notable man. Such an event is unusual, not only in our State but in the Nation and in world history. The most amazing fact is that I, their Representative in Congress, can join, through an airborne message, in the celebration held so far away and that thousands of others

will participate as they sit in their homes listening to the radio.

This national legislative body may well pause to listen to the story of the career and era of a man who was a member of the Oregon State Legislature for a decade of legislative pioneering, from 1872 to 1882. This amazing man exemplifies pioneer physical strength and the pioneer characteristics of warm hospitality, quick decisive action, and a life motivated by the vision of things to come in a happy future, as the Nation moved toward fulfillment of its destiny. Think of this strong man today, 100 years of age, thoroughly enjoying life and friends, cheerful, hopeful, helpful as he sits before the great fireplace in his hospitable hall, sharing remembrances of the old days and recollections of men and events of the century through which he has lived.

EVENTS OF 1842

Let us picture for a moment the world into which Dunham Wright was born. Only 50 years had passed since Captain Gray had sailed into the Columbia River, to which he gave the name of his ship. Our Oregon—covering Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and part of Montana—was under joint occupancy by the United States and Great Britain, with boundary lines undecided. Beginning in 1838, with a bill to establish the Territory of Oregon, the subject of the rights of the United States in the Oregon country had been constantly before Congress. It was hoped the Oregon boundary dispute would be settled during the negotiations leading to the Webster-Ashburton Treaty, still pending in 1942. The colonists were talking about a provisional government, and plans were brewing which finally materialized in a meeting of Willamette Valley settlers at Champoe on May 2, 1843, leading to a government grounded on the broadest principles of democracy.

Jason Lee and Marcus Whitman, missionaries, were still in Oregon, and Whitman was soon to ride on that eastern trip to save his mission. Dr. John McLoughlin, chief factor of the Hudson's Bay Co., had just founded Oregon City. Oregon Institute—Willamette University—long the center of learning on the Pacific coast, was organized the year Dunham was born. Here I must interject an explanation of my reference to the great man by his first name, "Dunham." According to pioneer custom, the men affectionately regarded by the people among whom they lived were usually known by their first names, and young and old in our country today speak of the Honorable Dunham Wright as Dunham or Uncle Dunham.

One of the most significant westward movements of the world's history took place one year after Dunham was born. That was the great 2,000-mile Oregon Trail migration of '43, which tied the Northwest to the United States. In that year the first wagon train reached the Columbia River. The exploring expedition of Fremont traveled through central Oregon. Eighteen hundred and forty-three was such an important and momentous year in the history of the Oregon Territory and the old Oregon

Trail that I have introduced into this House a bill authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the hundredth anniversary of those great events, and I hope my colleagues will have the pleasure of affixing to their letters such a commemorative stamp and that they will then recall something of its meaning and significance. If peace should settle upon our land and upon the world, we shall expect to see many of you in Oregon to help us celebrate an epochal event in American history.

TRAVELING IN 1842

The first great overland exploring expedition to Oregon, undertaken at the order of President Jefferson by Lewis and Clark, had occurred about 40 years before Dunham's birth. This expedition was piloted part way by the Indian heroine, Sacajawea, whose name has been given to the hotel in which the celebration in honor of Dunham Wright is being held tonight.

The men and women who think today of Dunham Wright and his remarkable life, in the most swiftly changing century of human history, will turn to the printed record to read once again the story of significant national events and amazing changes of the century which has passed since this grand old man was born in the humble little cottage in the Territory of Iowa. He typifies the change in the American scene because he made his way across the wilderness country to the frontier which has now vanished. He has kept step with our progress in thought and in inventions, utilizing all for the utmost good of his fellow man. He learned to use a typewriter after he was 84.

When Dunham Wright was born, the first railroad had just reached Washington; the telegraph was not an accomplished fact for another 2 years; and the telephone undreamed of. It was the day of the tallow candle and the whale-oil lamp, over a decade before kerosene was used. The first United States postage stamp had been issued 2 years previously. There is an interesting story in Josiah Quincy's *Figures of the Past* of a trip from Boston to New York, starting at 3 o'clock Friday morning and reaching New York Monday morning; so thankful that they lived in the days of quick transportation, as it formerly took a week. Now the time is less than 2 hours by airplane. Quincy tells of a plan to put light boats and fast-moving horses on the canal system, and it was hoped that they could possibly make 8 miles an hour. Steamboats were just beginning to cross the Atlantic. Our country was not threaded by roads nor by railroads. Travel was by coach and horseback over roads often unfit for wagons. There were trails on which lives were endangered by the wild animals then beating the paths later followed by Indians, then by white men, then by the railroads. These trans-continental roads were being laid out by the wild animals—buffalo, elk, and deer—the locators of the transportation systems of our America.

THE GREAT PLAINS IN '42

I have a very vivid memory of acres of whitened buffalo bones that were to

be viewed at the head of many canyons when I crossed the plains. The buffalo would go down to the running streams to drink and then slowly make their way up the canyons out to the tablelands. The repeating rifle had just been perfected and hunters with these rifles, sheltered in protected huts, would shoot the buffalo as they came up and would take their hides. The principal occupation of the early settlers of that short-grass country was gathering these bones and hauling them many, many miles to the railroad stations where they were shipped east for fertilizer. This was 22 years later than the time when our honored pioneer crossed the same country.

There was a story I have never forgotten about the way the buffalo treated the first telegraph poles that were erected on the plains where the railroads were being built. They found them good rubbing posts for their tough old hides and they came in great numbers. Of course, the poles gave way and the lines fell to the ground. After putting up the poles several times, only to have them rubbed down by a new band of buffalo, orders came from New York for the men in the construction force to put sharpened spikes in those poles so that the buffalo would not use them, but, instead, the buffalo were even more highly pleased with the spikes, and they came all the way from Canada, it is said, to enjoy rubbing on the spiked poles. Never were they able to maintain the telegraph lines against the depredations of the buffalo, until they had killed off the herds. We cooked over fires made of buffalo chips even in '82. The herds must have been numbered in the millions when Dunham was born, and numerous when he traveled west.

OUR PUBLIC LIFE A CENTURY AGO

In Dunham's natal year, the population of the United States was slightly over seventeen millions, now six great cities total as many millions. Only 104,565 were immigrants and other aliens. A new America was being created west of the Alleghenies and the center of population had shifted to Clarksburg, then in western Virginia. The population of Washington, D. C., was about 40,000. The national debt was then twenty-six and a half millions, now it is more than twice that many billions.

Slavery existed and was supposed to be a permanent institution. Indeed, slave trade was carried on in this Capital City, and each political party had its pro- and anti-slavery wing. California and the great Southwest were Mexican territory. Texas was an independent republic. The United States Bank had failed in 1841, bringing about universal financial distress. New York was celebrating the completion of the Croton Aqueduct. In November 1842, Abraham Lincoln was married to Mary Todd.

When our hero was born, in 1842, it was only 16 years after the passing of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence. McCormick's great invention, the reaper, had been perfected only 8 years when Dunham was a babe in Iowa. Andrew Jackson was living when he was born. There were also many soldiers

who had fought in the Revolutionary War, for it was only 61 years from the time of his birth that the smoke had cleared away from the smooth-bore cannon that had compelled Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown. What a link with the past is this man, Dunham Wright.

IN CONGRESS IN 1842

The Washington Monument had just been completed to 221 feet, about one-half its present height. The dome of the Capitol was not built until 20 years later, and the wings housing this room, and the one in which the Senate meets, had not been constructed. In fact, they were not started until 10 years later.

John Tyler was President of the United States, and having his troubles, too. Daniel Webster was Secretary of State; Justice Taney was Chief Justice. John White of Kentucky was Speaker of this House, and Henry Clay was, in a few days, to resign from the Senate. The Twenty-seventh Congress was in its second session, in this Capitol but not in this room. There were 294 Members in place of our present 531 of the Seventy-seventh Congress; 242 in the House and 52 in the Senate. The parties at that time were Whigs, Democrats, and Tylerites. In the Senate there were 28 Whigs, 22 Democrats, and 2 Tylerites. The House was composed of 133 Whigs, 102 Democrats, and 6 Tylerites, with 1 vacancy.

Japan was then practically unknown to the world, as its doors were not opened by Perry until 12 years after our friend's birth. Thirty years previous to that date, Napoleon had warned European civilization saying, "Beware when the Chinaman learns the art of war." To people of his day Chinese and Japanese belonged to the same group. They have now learned the art of war and today they have brought us into the terrific world struggle which threatens our way of life.

HIGH ADVENTURE A CENTURY AGO

Turning from the national scene, I am reminded by the one hundredth birthday of this grand old hero of events in the life of our West during his childhood, the gold rush of '49 and the few years following the initial rush. It should never be forgotten that the forty-niners and those immediately thereafter were unique in world's history. The great body of those adventurers followed two routes. There was the group that went by water to Panama, then across the Isthmus and by boat north to California. Others traversed what seemed like the almost endless plains through the "short grass country," climbed over the high mountains, crossed dangerous and almost impassable rivers and reached the gold coast by the overland route. Those who constituted this body of emigrants were from the farms and small villages of the Middle West pioneer communities. They were generally young men, 16 years of age up to 30. They were untrained in mining or in any of the ways of business—just rough, good-natured western American frontier boys.

MINER'S LUCK

This migration reached California in the fall of '49 and for 15 years there was an almost unbroken stream of recruits

added thereto. "Uncle Dunham" was a part of that migration. I, coming 20 years later into the West, was not a real part of it, but I knew many of the men personally, first in Colorado and then in Oregon when they were men in middle life. They were rough in exterior and in speech, men who looked you straight in the eye, told you the truth and expected in return a square deal. Failing to get it, they "drew from the hip." When these boys came into the West they had to learn the art of mining, most of them knew nothing about the technicalities of the occupation in which they were engaged.

The remarkable fact is that the rushing, eager group of active pioneers discovered in 15 years every placer gold field from Mexico to the Arctic Circle, except Klondike. They not only discovered these gold deposits but they mined them, taking the gold out and turning it into the channels of trade by the ton. As an example I cite Canyon Creek, Grant County, Oregon, where they discovered a placer gold strip. In less than 3 years they took out from 2½ miles of that creek over \$20,000,000 in gold, in washings. About \$10,000,000, or 20 tons of gold, was taken out by those pioneer boys from every mile that they mined. It has always been a favorite theory of mine that the gold which poured into the channels of trade, following the discovery of that precious metal in California in '49, was one of the chief factors in building the prosperity of the middle nineteenth century.

MINERS OF '49 WERE REAL MEN

These young miners learned to cook their meals beside the road in a rain-storm or in the driving snow. They learned to shoe a horse, or ox, beside the road at an improvised forge. They learned to build for themselves, quickly, a covering from the storm. They learned to live with the wild animals, and with each other. In many communities they framed their own laws and afterwards their rules were incorporated into the laws of the land.

The boys who constituted this migration were self-reliant. If the Indians bothered them, taking toll of the struggling settlers, they organized their own expeditions to teach the Indians good behavior. They knew what it was to go hungry. They knew what it was to sleep in the open and to watch the stars. They knew what it was to wake up in the morning with several inches of snow on their blankets. They never thought of appealing to Washington "or any other seaport," for a housing project. They never dreamed of asking someone to build a bridge across the stream. They swam the stream or built a bridge with their own hands. A few years ago there was a picture on the screen known as the "Covered Wagon." It was a very vivid portrayal of the trials of these pioneer men and their women, who shared in the hardships and joys of the trail.

HORSEMEN AND LONG-LINE DRIVERS

These men were some of the finest horsemen ever developed. They rode and they drove expertly. Almost without roads, they headed those freighter

wagons West, with their 8 to 16 mules or horses; the driver often sitting on a wheel animal with one line reaching out to the leader, perhaps in a 16-mule team. Every animal knew the word spoken by the driver, and they minded like children. The story of those long-line or jerk-line drivers is a thrilling one yet unwritten. I can remember with what admiration I watched those California drivers, who had been in the gold rush of '49, and had then come back in the Leadville rush. They would drive those wagons and their long stream of animals up the almost impossible hillsides and swing them around sudden curves over the brink of terrifying precipices.

As I write of the prowess of these rugged men of the forties and fifties I just wonder what has happened to the people of some sections of the far West today and what has made them so dependent and so fearful. There are those who have begged to have the Japanese remain among them under guard to raise their vegetables and tend their orchards. They begged that the War Department would not evacuate alien enemies and leave them to their own resources to provide vegetable foods! The real descendants of the pioneers, the real westerners about whom I have spoken, must be the ones who sent word back to Washington that they will take care of the coast and of the Japanese if they can just be furnished the armaments and munitions of war.

MEN WERE HONEST THEN

There was a degree of honesty and friendship existing between these pioneer boys that we in this decadent and sordid age can scarcely understand. I recall one day, in the summer of 1882, watching a man hang a beef up in one high tree at the bend of the road where one trail led to the west coast and the other to the mines around Leadville. I remember asking him what he was doing and he said, "This is the way I sell my beef. See that sign down there." It read, "If you want to buy some beef, let one of these quarters down by the ropes and cut off what you want. You will find scales at the foot of the tree to weigh it. You will find gold scales in the box. Leave the money in the tin box marked 'money.' Thank you." In other words, a passerby on the long, long road to the West could help himself to a forequarter or hind-quarter, cut off what he wanted, weigh it and pay, leaving the money behind him. I said to the man, "Do they not steal your money?" He said, "You must be a tenderfoot." That is what he said. "Just arrived in the mountains?" I replied, "Only a few weeks ago." He answered, "I thought so; only a tenderfoot would ask such a question."

Indeed, there was a code of personal honesty and belief in the honesty of fellow men in those pioneer days almost unknown today and not practiced by the "highly civilized" citizens of the twentieth century. All over the mountains west of the river—and by "the river," cattlemen always means the Missouri—ever since those pioneer days, it has been the rule of the camp never to lock the doors of the sheep or cattle cabin. The passerby

was welcome to go into the house or cabin and cook a meal for himself. The one invariable rule was that he had to leave clean dishes and fuel when he went away. In my operations in the West, I never thought of a lock on a cabin or on my ranch houses in the early days. For some reason or other, everything now has to be under lock and key.

Dunham Wright's work was accomplished in an atmosphere he and his kind have always created. No one in legislative hall or in political convention ever, in his presence, laid plans for a dishonest act. Skulduggery was foreign to his make-up and his conduct. Out of the lives of such men has come the America of which we are so proud, which today faces its supreme test, not only on the field of battle, but also in the field of our public life which must be held and kept incorruptible, lest we perish. A prominent American-Japanese once said to me, "We never make a contract that we would not break, if to our advantage—contract made to fool the other fellow." Directly opposite from the teachings of the pioneer. A word spoken or a contract made was binding upon him and his conscience, whether expressed in written legal terms or by word of mouth. He typifies the American character molded and shaped by the exigencies of life in the mountains of the far West. Today, we see tested, on terrible battlefields, the pioneer characters of Americans, and Australians, as against the code of Nippon, underlined by deception.

A STATESMAN OF OLD OREGON

Let us turn now from the world in which he lived and the pioneer character which he exemplified to a few of the incidents in the life story of the centenarian, Dunham Wright. Because my own public career was what first linked me with Dunham Wright, 50 years ago this summer, when I was a candidate for County Clerk of Umatilla County in Oregon, I like to think of him, first, as a public man. He was then candidate for joint Senator from Umatilla, Morrow, and Union Counties. We traveled together, speaking from the same platforms. He taught me some of the arts of public speaking, suggesting to me how to tell stories which would bring out points. I remember he said to me in those far-off days: "Walter, never tell an off-color story, and never use an oath in a speech." What good advice. "Also," he said, "speak in a voice so people can understand you and do not forget to sit down before you have exhausted your subject." Truly, Dunham was a natural-born orator. After he was past 90, I have heard that musical and magnificent voice roll forth, holding audiences spell-bound while he gave reminiscences of the past and stories of the pioneer days. The America of his dreams is still the America of our dreams, which our sons are today going forth to protect by fighting in the uttermost parts of the earth.

For 10 years of the formative period of Oregon statehood, 1872-1882, Dunham Wright was a member of the Oregon State Legislature; 4 years in the house and 6 years in the senate, elected when he was 30 years of age. He was in the

legislature when the capitol building at Salem was located and planned, the cornerstone being laid in 1873. He tells of his journey to our Oregon capital in 1872, made thrilling by his first view of a railroad train, and his terror of the locomotive engine as it bore down toward the little platform at The Dalles, Oreg., where he boarded the train, after traveling 250 miles from his eastern Oregon home by horseback.

LINCOLN IN UNCLE DUNHAM'S LIFE

Uncle Dunham, as he is affectionately called throughout Oregon, had little interest in amassing material wealth. He loved his lands and he had an abiding faith in the future of Medical Springs health resort, to the building of which he gave so many years, erecting much of it with his own hands. When that resort was destroyed by fire 24 years ago he lost his most precious possession, a Bible given to him by his grandfather, William Hanks, and bearing on its flyleaf the name of Abraham Lincoln, who had used the Bible and was a nephew of Dunham's grandfather.

I have spoken of Dunham's connection with the family of our great President Lincoln. There were many ties between the families. Dunham's father had been a soldier with Lincoln in the Black Hawk War. They had worked together surveying. Dunham voted for Lincoln for President, and he is probably one of the few men in the United States who has voted at every Presidential election since that time. He knows the Presidents and what they stood for. He knows United States history, because he has been a part of it, and a close student. Now, on his one-hundredth birthday, he enjoys good eyesight and every day he reads his papers. Every day he draws from his remarkable memory the stories of the past and the poems he recited in school 93 years ago.

Dunham Wright was born in what was then the Territory of Iowa, near New London. His mother died when he was 2 years old, and he went to live with his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. William Hanks. William was the brother of Nancy Hanks, the mother of Abraham Lincoln. The grandmother was a midwife, and she is the one who took into her arms the babe, Abe Lincoln, washed him, and put the first clothes on him, tiny garments made from his mother's linsey-woolsey dress. Little did she realize that she held in her arms a future President of the United States, the Great Emancipator. The bed on which Nancy lay was roughly made of common boards, and the covering was of the skins of wild animals, so Dunham's grandmother told him. This connection of Dunham Wright with Lincoln is one of the most significant things about his life.

WESTWARD HO—MINING AND FREIGHTING

At the age of 18 Dunham joined a train of 200 wagons moving from Iowa across the plains. Steady travel by ox team, making 8 or 10 miles a day, brought them in the fall of 1860 to Denver, a city of many tents and 8 cabins. Twenty-two years later I, too, reached Denver, Colo., in a covered wagon, in 1882. Den-

ver had then grown into quite a Western city, still with many tents. Clearly do I recall the camping grounds near the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad shops where I and my company joined the many other campers. When Dunham Wright reached Denver, mining was booming. He first worked in a lumber camp and whipsawed lumber at \$2 a foot. Twenty-two years I also worked in a lumber camp, not far from Denver. We then had a circular saw, but no modern sawmill equipment.

Dunham Wright worked for George M. Pullman of "palace car" fame who then owned the Gregory mine at Central City, Colo., and had erected thereon a 10-stamp quartz mill. The winter Dunham was 19 years old he spent in Estes Park with Uncle Joel Estes, who discovered it and made the first settlement there, giving his name to that beautiful mountain resort. After mining in different places in Colorado and southern Idaho, Dunham arrived in eastern Oregon in the spring of 1863. Captured by the scenery, the climate, and the opportunities, he has remained a citizen of our State. Exactly 20 years later, I, a boy from the Middle West, seeking my place in the world, yielding to the same charm and to the warm hospitality of eastern Oregon, became an Oregonian and have ever retained that designation, of which I am so proud.

Dunham and three other boys bought 20 pack mules, a big gray mare that carried a loud bell, and began packing miners' supplies from Umatilla Landing on the Columbia River, to Boise Basin mining region, a distance of nearly 400 miles. It required 13 days of steady traveling and mighty good luck to make the trip way up the Umatilla River, over the Blue Mountains, through the Grande Ronde Valley, and across the Snake River into the famous gold fields of Boise Basin. Peter Rudio, the grandfather of my children, and Henry Heppner, for whom an Oregon county seat is named, packed over the same trail, at the same time. They packed all sorts of foodstuffs and mining supplies, including powder, tools, ten-gallon kegs of whisky—very necessary in mining camps. Dunham likes to tell a story about a pack animal falling and smashing in the head of a keg of wine. The trail was full of frozen tracks which quickly filled with wine. The men drank the wine out of the tracks and, as a result, they made only 4 miles instead of 20 that day.

A PIONEER FARMER

After following packing for 2 years, Dunham settled in the Grande Ronde Valley, my home. He brought the first mowing machine that ever came into that valley, where wild hay grew luxuriantly. With relays of horses, the mower ran constantly all daylight and all night on moonlight nights. If they broke a section in the sickle by striking a rock or a picketing pin left, perhaps, by one of the squaws, it would cost them \$5 to have a local blacksmith make a new section out of a shovel. That was in 1865-66 and, ever since, Dunham Wright has been a factor in the life of our section.

In July 1867 our hero married Artemisia Duncan in Cove, Oreg. She had

crossed the plains in 1864 with her parents and 10 brothers and sisters. The marriage ceremony was performed by Rev. J. M. DeMoss, father of the famous musical family of Oregon that traveled over the United States and Europe on their musical tours. Mrs. Wright was a country school teacher and helped her husband in making up for the education that he had missed when he was a boy. The year after their marriage they located 25 miles from any other habitation, in the mountains at Medical Springs, where they had found a large flow of hot mineral water in which the Indians had been bathing since time immemorial. Dunham constructed the wagon roads from this mountain retreat to civilization. He now lives in comfort in this place which he homesteaded 74 years ago.

It was my pleasure when I was first sent to Washington to intercede to keep alive the post office at Medical Springs, established by Dunham 54 years ago. A modern sawmill had located less than 2 miles from Medical Springs, and, not knowing the historical associations, the owners had endeavored to move the post office. However, Dunham still gets his mail at Medical Springs.

PUBLIC LIFE AND POLITICS

Four years after he had established his home at Medical Springs, Dunham was notified by letter, brought to him by a passing Indian, that he had been nominated for State representative on the democratic ticket of Baker County, which then included Malheur, Union, and Wallowa Counties. He campaigned these counties for votes, on horseback, carrying his bed and grub with him, stopping some nights at log cabins. Homes were few and far between. Elected a member of the legislature, he was paid the sum of \$3 per day and mileage, the same remuneration I received as a member many years later, but the mileage gold he received bought many things to make life easier for the family in the mountains back home. Forty years ago this summer I was a candidate for the Oregon Senate. I received the strong support of Dunham Wright and his friends, who also assisted in my reelection to the senate. He was active when I was elected Governor of the State in 1922. When I was first talked of as Congressman from our district Dunham urged my nomination. After an acquaintance of over a half century I hold him as one of my dearest and best friends.

As I salute and honor Dunham and dwell upon his era and its setting I think of his faithful daughter and her husband, Grace and Pat Powers, who have been untiring in caring for their honored father and have made this day possible.

DUNHAM WRIGHT A FRIEND TO MAN

Most of the boys who came West in '49 died in poverty. They made money by the bucket full; they gave it away; and among them were some of the finest characters I have ever known. True as steel to a friend, generous to those in distress, they gave from their stores for charity and to help the underdog. Much has been written of them, in story and in song, but I have not read what I would consider an adequate description of those frontier characters. Dunham Wright

was one of them. No grander, kindlier soul ever lived. No better individual of higher motives ever breathed the air of eastern Oregon. Dunham Wright seemed to have as his object in life making people happy and the world better. He wanted to help people, and if everyone for whom he has done a favor should today bring to his centennial celebration at La Grande, Oreg., a wreath of flowers, there would certainly be a mound of them in that western city in the Blue Mountains where they are doing honor to him today on his one-hundredth birthday.

As my mind dwells on the man, Dunham Wright, and follows the hundred years of his life through the century of our national expansion in territory, in wealth, and in the comforts of life, there comes to me a poem, from an unknown writer in the heart of Australia in which:

THE PIONEERS SPEAK TO US

We shall not travel by the road we make;
Ere day by day the sound of many feet
Is heard upon the stones that now we break,
We shall be come to where the cross-roads meet.

For us the heat by day, the cold by night,
The inch-slow progress, and the heavy load,
And death at last to close the long grim fight
With man and beast and stone; for them the road.

For them the shade of trees that now we plant,
The safe, smooth journey and the final goal,
Yea, birthright in the land of covenant—
For us day labor, travail of the soul.

And yet the road is ours as never theirs!
Is not one joy on us alone bestowed?
For us the master—joy, O pioneers—
We shall not travel, but we make the road.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Bryson] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR RELATION TO THE PRESENT CRISIS AS CITIZENS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, during the past several months the American people have been literally snowed under by speeches on civilian defense responsibilities and related duties of the citizen in the present crisis. Still, I ask: "How well do we really know what our duties are as citizens in the present crisis?" Not so well as we think we do, I fear! Is it not possible that the deafening roar of the barrage after barrage of words which have been hurled in the projection of supercivilian defense undertakings and organizations on the home front—the very prominent noise of this heavier cannon fire—has muffled out of our hearing range the faint whistle of many small and simple, yet vital items in this matter of the citizen's relation to the present crisis?

It is the direct responsibility of every American citizen, be he rich or poor, weak or strong, on the battle front or in the home to seek to find to do his duty in helping to win our country's war.

DUTY NO. 1—TO KNOW WHAT WE ARE FIGHTING FOR

The first duty of every American today is the duty of knowing what we are fighting for. Here is our first great duty, but, unfortunately, thousands of Americans

have hardly dreamed of it, and other thousands have cast it aside without giving it a second thought. Too many of our people, too long persisting in the well-known shrug of the shoulder—"Oh, what difference does it make?" attitude, have skipped over this duty altogether, either failing to realize its importance or not caring to trouble their minds with any serious or thoughtful study of it. Make no mistake about this, the Nation pay—and often pays dearly, for the misdeeds of those who slack the duty of knowing for what we are fighting. For example, consider the horrible spectacle of a man in a defense industry laying down his tools and going on a strike during these dire days of national agony and peril. The man who commits such an unpardonable atrocity against the Nation's war effort is not only depraved with the most violent form of selfishness, he is disgracefully afflicted with a kind of dumbness and stupidity which comes, in large measure, from his neglectfulness in the duty of knowing what we are fighting to save; because, most assuredly, if he knew just what the winning or losing of this war is going to mean to him, to his family, and to his fellow workers in terms, possibly, of life itself, liberty itself, and the pursuit of happiness itself, he would, instead of making himself almost a traitor to his country, do everything within his power to work for her salvation. Any owner of furnace, farm, or factory who thinks first of profits at this crucial time is devoid of patriotism.

WORSE THAN SLAVERY

A nation cannot successfully fight a war half-heartedly. We must carry the fight to our enemies with conviction and determination. And this we can better do the sooner we fully understand just what we are fighting for and just what we have at stake in the outcome of this world-wide conflict in which we are engaged. Knowing this, we shall think of but one thing in facing the trials and tribulations of the present struggle, namely: that no cost, how high it be; no sacrifice, how large it be, is too much to pay for bringing about the defeat of the enemy.

It is time that every American realized what this war is about. We are not fighting for the glory of victory; we are fighting for the simple right of existence. Our enemies seek not merely to defeat us, they seek to make us their vassals. They seek, verily I warn, to place a yoke of subjugation on us and our children and the posterity of our children's children which will sap the vitality and spirit of a once free and proud people worse than chains of eternal slavery. I ask, How many people realize this? You ask, Is it really so bad as I paint it here? I answer, it is, and let no one persuade you to believe otherwise.

CONQUERED UNTO DEATH

The objective of our enemies is world domination. They aim to rule over us as masters over servants. Before the skeptics call this proposition fantastic let them be reminded that the Romans held the whip over their conquered peoples for more than 5 centuries. If our enemies succeed in what they are attempting they expect to hold us in check

with something a thousand times more powerful and effective than the ancient Roman legions. It is the airplane which, excluding its value to humanity in other ways, has been developed into the most destructive weapon in all history. It has already been proven that armies on the field of battle without air power and mechanized ground forces stand little or no chance of surviving against armies possessing air power and mechanized strength. Conceivably, if one nation possessed thousands of planes and tanks and then controlled the production facilities of another nation, allowing her no such arms, the unarmed nation could never hope to challenge the supremacy of the armed nation. The Axis plan of rule over us calls for exactly that—the permanent destruction of all of our plants which produce planes and armored equipment.

In this way, once our enemies gained a grip on us every attempt to revolt against their tyranny and rule over us would prove futile and hopeless because our patriots would be smashed quickly with the cold steel of their armies of occupation. Since the Germans and Japanese regard themselves as racially superior to us, it is difficult to approximate the ends to which the Huns and yellow men would go to keep us at the bottom of a slave society. In Poland the Germans are carrying forward with great system and efficiency the destruction of a whole race of people by placing them in concentration camps and then feeding them the germs of deadly diseases. This is the character of the enemies we are fighting. No, my friends, we are not fighting for the glory of victory; we are fighting for the right of existence.

LIGHTS OF CIVILIZATION

Lest we forget, we are fighting to preserve our way of life as well as to destroy the grasping hands of our enemies. We are, in short, fighting for the preservation of the American way of life. That way of life was not born in a day nor in a decade. More than a century was required to win its rights and establish its claims—even more than the 150 years of our history have been required in its growth and development, I should point out, because the struggle for man's freedom began a long, long time ago. The struggle for Christianity, which, like democracy, symbolizes the foundation of the American way of life, began 20 centuries ago. Now we hold in firm belief these precious lights of civilization. But men of armed force, who do not believe in God or Christ, dictators, they are, who preach to their people the gospel of racial superiority and require them to worship the state as their only religion—these madmen, seeking, as they do, to impose their order of living upon the whole world, have shouted that they have no use for American way of life and that it is their intention to snuff out our lights of Christianity and democracy. If the American people know fully of these threats, which our adversaries make against us, we shall hurl them back with ample margin for victory. Thus, the duty of knowing what we are fighting for comes first, and let no citizen fall short for failing it.

DUTY NO. 2—TO KEEP THE FAITH

The next duty of every American today is: The duty of keeping the faith—first in this duty of keeping the faith is that of keeping faith in the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, the President of the United States. He is now, more than ever before, the captain of our ship, and if as a Nation we are to make it safely past the storms and treacherous reefs that lie ahead the captain must have the support and loyal backing of his mates.

Rest assured that our enemies will do everything within their power to dislodge the confidence and trust we have reposed in our great President. Their chief hope is to sow the seeds of dissention and dissatisfaction amongst us which will bear the evil fruit of bitter complaints and angry criticisms of the President.

We must not allow the Axis Powers to trick us into feeling that the President is blundering or making mistakes in our war strategy. This is undoubtedly one of our enemies' main purposes at the moment as evidenced by their activity in sinking merchant ships near our shores and shelling points on the Atlantic and Pacific coast lines. These shellings do little material or military damage but they are calculated to do political damage to the administration by way of striking a division in public opinion on the President's announced policy of sending fighting men and materials to the larger theaters of war away from continental United States. This is but one of many devices being employed by the Axis to confuse and mislead the American people in their understanding and appraisal of the Government's war policies.

FAITH IN OUR PRESIDENT

To date the Axis propagandists have found the American people hard to fool because, despite some heavy blows here and there, they have remained calm and firm in their faith in their chosen leader. In the months that are to come we must be prepared to bear up under the shock of other hard blows; but temporary losses, when they come, must not be made the occasion for losing faith in the judgment, wisdom, and capacity of our Commander in Chief. If ever we weaken and fall into the sin of distrust a fatal disaster will be on us. We must, therefore, keep the faith in our Commander in Chief so that our determination to avert such disaster will far out-do the efforts of our enemies to have it thrust upon us.

FAITH IN OUR ARMED FORCES

The duty of keeping the faith applies to our armed forces likewise. The foundation of this faith is: That the fighting men of America, the sons of each generation of Americans, in all our history, have never lost a war they fought for us. What of today? I contend that in courage, stamina—physical, mental, and spiritual—and in fighting ability, the boys marching out of our homes and into the lines of battle today are as good as any that ever answered the call to colors, and the Nation should be as grateful for them as their mothers and fathers have a right to be proud of them. Evidence of the high valor and superior fighting ability of the American soldier and sailor already

stands before us: McArthur and his men on Bataan Peninsula, whose rugged defense and brilliant counter blows against overwhelming odds surpasses our imagination; the handful of Marines on Wake Island who withstood a siege which ranks their achievements with the Alamo; the so-called Fighting Tigers, ace American pilots in China who are knocking Japanese craft out of the air at a rate of 10, sometimes more than 20 to 1; the greatly outnumbered units of our fleet which aided in sinking a whole Japanese armada in the Strait of Macassar. The valor and fighting ability of our men in these engagements is the same kind of valor and fighting ability which, when once fully armed, will be hot on the enemies' tail, blasting their ships out of the skies, sending their floating vessels to the bottom of the seas and crushing the units of his land forces into thousands of disintegrated bits. This is the very kind of retaliation we must, and we shall mete out to enemies who have stabbed us in the back and seek to fasten their filthy hands on our throats.

But, in the midst of these opening frames of the war, when the going has naturally been toughest for us, the Axis has been doing everything within its power to weaken our faith in our armed forces. You will remember that immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor the Japanese radio swung into high gear and loudly boasted that practically all of our fighter and bomber planes concentrated at this mid-Pacific fortress, as well as the bulk of the American Navy situated in adjacent waters, had been destroyed. The Japanese claimed that they had crippled our sea and air power in the Pacific beyond all possibility of replacement or repair. As baseless and untrue as were these wild and fantastic claims, they were made for the purpose of discrediting our fighting forces which the Japanese hoped would have both the effect of causing an immediate weakening of the faith of the American people in their Army and Navy and setting into motion a run-away flood of disaster rumors.

LOOSE TALK DANGEROUS

When the President delivered his February 23 address to the Nation, he gravely warned that the citizen who willfully or carelessly degenerates into a defeatist-monger, peddling loose talk and unfounded rumors, is playing the fate of the Nation right into the hands of the enemy. Too many citizens are prone to ask out loud: "Where is the Navy? Where are our airplanes?" and like questions. Impatient, they expect to receive news hot off the wires at all times as to every move in the theater of war, this despite the well-known fact that most moves must be kept secret if a plan of strategy is to be executed successfully. The point I wish to make is this: It should not be necessary, and we must realistically face the fact that it is oftentimes absolutely impossible, for our high command to furnish the public with a play-by-play description of its operations in order to bolster the faith of the American people in our armed forces. The thing not to be forgotten is that to feel and do his best the man who is out in the front lines

charging against the bullets of the enemy needs and must have your faith and confidence behind him; and, regardless of what means our enemies employ to shake and destroy that faith and confidence, you must resolve to keep it intact. That is standing up to the duty of keeping the faith in our armed forces.

FAITH IN OUR ALLIES

Keeping the faith with our Allies, that is important, too. Divide and conquer has been one of the mainsprings of Axis strategy to date. Defeat one nation at a time until at last the few surviving peoples will not stand a chance of resistance. This has been the long-range objective of our enemies. Today the United States should be thankful for her Allies: England, which refused to give up the ghost after the fall of France and the horror of Dunkerque; England, which may have saved civilization when she guarded a narrow strip of water under the white cliffs of Dover, and stood up under Germany's rain of death and destruction from the air; and Russia, which, if she is able to do nothing more, has destroyed the myth of German invincibility by withstanding the mightiest onslaught ever known, and then sweeping the Nazi invasion hordes before her; and China, which under the leadership of that military genius, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, has with hardly more than her bare hands frustrated Japanese military penetrations for over 5 years; and the Dutch, the Australians, the Canadians, and the other brave peoples who are fighting by our side.

The Axis wish more than anything else to isolate the United States from her Allies, that to be accomplished by destroying our faith and trust in them. Fifth columnists and Nazi sympathizers in our country, which, in my opinion, should be hanged wherever they are found, are at work today trying to spread distrust and drive a wedge between ourselves and the nations fighting on our side. They would have us complain about the Russians being Communists; the Chinese, orientals; and the British, imperialists. They would have us believe that we should not share our equipment and supplies with our Allies. They do not wish for us to be united in our war against them because they realize that united as a group of nations we shall crush them to the ground, and only if they have a chance at us singly will it be possible to defeat us. They would trick the United States into losing faith in her Allies; of withdrawing our support from our Allies; of retreating into a shell of isolationism and sealing our doom for the future. But we must not be tricked, we must not be fooled, we must not be drawn away from the duty of keeping the faith in our Allies.

FAITH IN OURSELVES

Finally, through it all—the good and the bad, the hard and the easy, the bright and the dark—we have the duty of keeping the faith in the American people and the American way of life. That means keeping faith in ourselves as the citizens of the greatest democracy on the face of the earth. We must strive to keep the faith in Christianity, democ-

racy, and American citizenship because, as one writer recently put it:

Our enemy is counting on us to be terrified. He hopes we will point trembling fingers at the maps of his invasions and wonder whether we have it in us, and in our democratic processes, to pit our unregimented lives against a system so highly organized, so completely ruthless. He thinks we have been so softened by our easy living and unprecedented personal liberties that our hearts will fail us when we confront an army composed of men who have been taught contempt for goodness and mercy.

If we are strong and abide by the duty of keeping faith in this democracy of ours we shall not be frightened by the boasts of efficiency which issue from Fascist Germany, Japan, and Italy. Instead, we shall take increased strength from our faith in democracy, realizing that it was under our, not their, industrial genius that mass production was developed; that it was the brains of our, not their, free-thinking scientists which led to the invention of the airplane, the tank, the steamship, the gasoline engine, and practically every weapon of modern warfare. In the past we have thrived on the freedom afforded by our institutions of government and we shall continue to thrive on it through this present test. The free, unregimented American boys of 1917 were quickly welded into a fighting force that drove the Germans from their trenches on the western front. And we shall drive them again; but this time all the way to Berlin and Tokyo.

Our leader, our armed forces, our Allies, and our people—they cannot, they must not, they shall not fail! So must be the immovable conviction of every American citizen. That is the duty of keeping the faith.

There are two other foremost duties of the citizen in the present crisis which I wish to suggest here. I should like to say much concerning each, but, wishing to avoid greater imposition on your time, I shall discuss them only briefly.

DUTY NO. 3.—TO DO OUR PART

This next duty, to which I have just referred, is the duty of doing our part. The civilian on the home front too often underestimates the value and importance of his efforts to the successful prosecution of the war. It occurs all too frequently that the average citizen, surmising that he is far removed from advanced positions in the scene of conflict where men do their actual fighting and dying, feels that he has no part in the action. But he does have a part in this action, and in this day of total war the part played by the civilian is more important than ever before. Total war means war ranging over a wide area—that area today being the whole world—with tremendous quantities of arms and fighting equipment, prevailing today in a high state of mechanization. Additionally, this total war is waged against civilians and military personnel alike. As suggested in my discussion of keeping the faith, the enemy is ever seeking to pull the props from under our armed forces and war strategy by destroying the public faith and confidence necessary to their successful operation. But resistance to such enemy at-

tempts is not the only part to be played by the citizen in total war. He must play a more energetic part by making certain positive contributions to the war effort as well.

To keep a man armed and equipped on the field of battle today calls for the labor on the home front of two or three times the number of workers formerly required. In total warfare more of everything is needed quicker. The tendency of the average citizen is, nevertheless, to feel at a loss to add anything material to the war effort. Unless he is employed in a defense industry he will incline to overlook his part by saying, "Oh, well, I can't help; I don't work in a plant producing planes or tanks."

He inclines to feel that his services in civilian defense will come to naught unless he happens to live in a large city, like New York, Washington, or San Francisco, which is likely to be made the target of an enemy air raid at any moment. He thinks of the heroic and all-important role the civilian played in London, Coventry, and other British centers of population during the murderous assaults of the German Luftwaffe in the fall of 1939 and winter of 1940, but he is unable to visualize a repetition of anything like that over here. My answer to that common inclination is this: In the duty of doing our part none of us has the right to regard anything as impossible, however improbable it may appear today. While at all times hoping for the best, we must still always be preparing for the worst. So I urge, encourage, and implore each of you to lend your full help and support to the Government's civilian defense efforts. Every able-bodied American should endeavor to make some contribution to this work.

UNSUNG HEROES OF WAR

The undramatic sometimes counts the most. Wars have ever been won by the unsung heroes; and much of the outcome of this war hangs on the part to be played by millions of unsung heroes on the home front. I am speaking now of the millions of Americans who do their part in ways other than those already suggested. The family, for instance, that makes up its mind to and succeeds in "getting by" on less plays its part in the role of conservation. I cannot overemphasize the importance of conservation in everything we consume, from the sugar on your table to the tires on your car. Total war demands unbelievable quantities of everything. New scarcities in materials of all sorts are showing up every day; shortages are certain to spread in all directions as the war progresses. Price Administrator Leon Henderson stated to a congressional committee earlier in this month that "not a single pound of crude rubber will be available for the some 30,000,000 passenger cars in the United States." It was also stated by the Price Administrator that the day may be near at hand when the Government will be compelled to requisition tires now on cars of ordinary citizens.

Thus it is not beyond the realm of possibility to speculate that the rubber on our cars today, if properly conserved, may tomorrow send the last-needed battalion of tanks or squadron of planes

speeding over the enemies' lines to final victory. The individual who is given to wastefulness today not only fails to do his part for our country; he aids the enemy who profits by our losses.

Make every moment count in your work, no matter what your craft, trade, or profession. It bears a relation to total production, although its relation may not appear on the surface. "Time is short"—production experts are pounding that phrase home over and over again. The duty of doing your part also means speed in your every endeavor. Do the best you can, as quickly as you can.

It has been estimated that in Julius Caesar's time the cost of killing an enemy soldier was only 75 cents, but that in this war we must pay at least \$50,000 for each dead Jap and German. To meet the staggering costs of this war, every citizen must do his part by paying taxes, buying Defense bonds, and otherwise lending all possible financial assistance.

Yes, the citizen does have a part, a very real and mighty important daily role to play in the winning of this war. I have mentioned only a few of the many opportunities for contributing to the war effort available to the citizen who seeks to do the duty of doing his part.

DUTY NO. 4.—TO KEEP UP THE GOOD SPIRIT

In concluding my remarks on the subject of our relation to the present crisis as citizens, I wish to mention briefly one further duty which is vitally essential to America's ultimate victory. It is the duty of keeping up the good spirit—good spirit, strong purpose, high optimism—call it morale; call it esprit de corps; call it what we may; but I pray that never we shall forget it or lose it, because it is the vital substance which carries nations on to victory; or, lacking, robs them of the hope of success. Armies on the field of battle must possess it; the supporting population on the home front must come forward with it.

When fed with enthusiasm, confidence, and firmness of purpose, the spirit of victory thrives; when poisoned with indifference, complacency, and fear it deteriorates; and when the spirit of a nation deteriorates its physical strength soon disintegrates. The American people, I hope, and believe, are now freeing themselves of the dragnet of complacency and our spirits are gaining altitude. The good spirit which we are gaining will be maintained to the day of final victory if we will but fire our determination with the right kind of confidence. Making no mistake about the power and vicious methods of our enemies, we must realize all the way through that by making ourselves strong—not by hoping for or relying upon the weakness of our enemies—we shall sweep them before us. Beware of confidence founded on false optimism, but take hold of confidence founded on realism and the determination to win.

CHRISTIAN COURAGE

The days may seem dark, the prospects gloomy at times, but if we of this Christian world are worthy of the faith we profess, we shall derive comfort and courage from the Scriptures, for—

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for

Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.

Across the Pacific and across the Atlantic our boys are sailing, probably thousands of them at this very hour, to their battle stations in this far-flung struggle which is on us. We can count on them. They will fight bravely, heroically, as our defenders. They must count on us to prove their dauntless supporters by doing the duty of keeping up the good spirit until the last blow has been struck and the last shot fired.

WE OR THEY?

To summarize and conclude: The crucial test is on; the fateful decision is in the making. What we do, or fail to do, now will determine the shape of things to come. For your thoughtful consideration, I ask: We, in our expression of reverence toward God, or they, in their worship of dictators and idolatry of the state; we, with our democracy as a form of liberty, or they, with their fascism as a form of tyranny; we, with our free peoples, or they, with their regimented digits of humanity; we, who hold for the world the hope of civilization, or they, who carry for it the terror and threat of barbarism; we, who deny racial supremacy, or they, who embrace it; we, who when we have won the battle will have saved for ourselves and humanity the priceless possessions of our heritage, or they, who if allowed to win are to sit as master over the conquered subjects of a slave society? There is but one answer. It must be we—not they. America has set her sights for victory, and to the winning of that victory for every American citizen this creed I now propose:

PLEDGE OF DUTY

I believe in God Almighty as the Supreme Being over all men, of the universe; I believe in the democratic form of government and the American way of life, which were wrought for us by sacrifice, in blood, toil, and perseverance of the brave men and women who have preceded us in the annals of our Nation's history; and, resolved in the duty of knowing what we are fighting for, the duty of keeping the faith, the duty of doing my part and the duty of keeping up the good spirit, I pledge—even to the giving up of all I have or hold in life and property—myself for the preservation and continuation of the American way of life with liberty and the pursuit of happiness as secured for us by the great vision and long-suffering of our forebears. So help us, God, to win victory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

APPOINTMENT OF COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE, ST. LOUIS DISTRICT, MO.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain editorials from St. Louis newspapers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, if the present plans to appoint Robert Hanne-

gan, the discredited retiring chairman of the St. Louis Democratic Committee, to the post of collector of internal revenue for the St. Louis district go forward to a successful conclusion, it will be the rawest slap in the face the Federal administration could ever give the people in the great city of St. Louis.

Any man who has operated a political organization of the nature of the scandalous Dickmann-Hannegan machine in St. Louis would have little respect for Federal civil service.

How can we expect wholehearted cooperation from the people in the war effort when the administration, by political appointments, undermines the public morale by disregarding the people's mandate?

It is my desire to show the House here some of the things which are about to be perpetrated on the people of St. Louis through the attempt to appoint Mr. Hannegan collector of internal revenue.

Mr. Hannegan has for the last number of years been the chairman of the democratic city committee in the city of St. Louis, and he has been the head, at least the organization head, of what was known as the Dickmann-Hannegan machine, the same crowd of political cohorts who tried to steal the governorship of the State of Missouri a year ago after Republican Forrest Donnell was elected by some 3,700 votes to the governorship. Governor Donnell is a man of whom Missouri may be proud.

The great newspapers of the city of St. Louis feel so deeply and indignantly on this question that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has published a special edition in which it has devoted 3 or 4 pages to the subject, relating all the scandals of this political machine. The following is a part of what appeared in the Post-Dispatch on that occasion:

EX-BOSS HANNEGAN TO BE REWARDED WITH \$7,000 JOB—APPOINTMENT AS COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE LIKELY TO GO TO SENATE FOR CONFIRMATION THIS WEEK—SPONSORED BY BENNETT CLARK, WHO ALSO WAS IN ON THE "DEAL"—ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE POLITICAL HAND-OUT AS RESULT OF PRESSURE TO SERVE PARTY AND KEEP MACHINE INTACT—AGAIN THE STORY OF THE GOVERNORSHIP STEAL AND THE IMPORTANT PART HANNEGAN PLAYED IN IT—HOW THE PEOPLE KICKED DICKMANN OUT—HOW THE PRESIDENT IS ABOUT TO PUT HANNEGAN IN

(By Curtis A. Betts, State political correspondent of the Post-Dispatch)

One of the curious inconsistencies of life in democratic America is the blind and unreasoning loyalty to party, which so frequently takes precedence over loyalty to the public interest and, in many instances, loyalty to public decency.

Hoary tradition dictates that the rich political plums shall go to those who have served the party, regardless of any question of service to the public. The politician whom a Senator endorses, a President must appoint and the Senate confirm. Simply because of that custom, Robert E. Hannegan, retiring chairman of the St. Louis Democratic City Committee and partner in the scuttled Dickmann-Hannegan machine, is slated for reward and seems about to be rewarded this week with the \$7,000 job of United States collector of internal revenue in St. Louis.

Former Mayor Bernard F. Dickmann, senior partner in the ill-starred venture into the realm of "big time" politics, is in political oblivion, defeated for a third term a year

ago by a majority of 35,684, a crushing repudiation by an electorate which 4 years before had chosen him for the city's highest office by a majority of 48,170.

The organization headed by Dickmann and his sidekick, Hannegan, was wrecked by political greed and unconscionable grasping for power. It is floundering and helpless. It is unable even to agree upon a new chairman who has the confidence of the party members and is capable of rescuing it from the chaos into which it has been tumbled.

HANNEGAN TOOK THE FIRST OVERT STEP

But Hannegan is to be rewarded for past services. He was an active participant—indeed, he took the first overt step—in the disgraceful attempt to "steal" the governorship for Lawrence McDaniel, a machine cohort. He was loyal to United States Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK and to United States Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN. His organization had been faithful, as politicians view faith, and had delivered votes for them when they needed votes. So, regardless of public protest and public revulsion, the two Senators from Missouri are determined to pay their debt to him.

The political history of St. Louis was a sorry one during the 8 years of the Dickmann-Hannegan machine rule. Immediately after Dickmann's first election in 1933, there developed a step-by-step progress toward the building, of a machine to rival that of boss Tom Pendergast of Kansas City, whose debauchery of the ballot and of public officials led to his downfall and his incarceration in the penitentiary.

Even before the colossal blunder of the attempted governorship steal, the public had begun to grow restless under the threat of a machine designed to be more powerful even than Pendergast's. It had seen the machine under Hannegan's chairmanship invade the sanctity of the judiciary, it had seen the machine knife good candidates and place its tools on the circuit bench. It had known of the heavy padding of election registration lists.

But it was not until the machine's effort in 1940 to place in the Governor's office Lawrence McDaniel, the Dickmann-Hannegan candidate, through a sordid use of political might—the Democratic control of the legislature—that it so far overstepped the bounds of even political decency as to bring down upon it the overwhelming wrath of the voters. The voters defeated Dickmann for reelection by a majority almost as large as that by which they had elected him 4 years before, and by defeating him made certain that Hannegan could no longer head the party organization in St. Louis. They declared as vociferously as they could that they wanted no more of Dickmann, and no more of Hannegan, in position of public authority.

MACHINE LEADERS LOOKING AFTER SELVES

Until its foray into State politics the machine seemingly had a stranglehold on St. Louis. But it was not satisfied with that. Power breeds a desire for more power, and with the collapse of Pendergast the St. Louis politicians thought they saw the opening for control of Jefferson City and of the State, as well as St. Louis. To get that control the machine must have its man in the Governor's chair. Studying the list of available, it decided upon McDaniel, who was Dickmann's appointee as city excise commissioner, and who seemed to fill the bosses' requirements in every respect.

Dickmann and Senator Clark did not agree on a candidate in the early negotiations, Clark preferring Dan M. Nee, United States collector of internal revenue in Kansas City. But when trial balloons failed to show that Nee had the desired following, Clark withheld the go-ahead sign for Nee and joined with Dickmann in the support of McDaniel.

McDaniel's candidacy proved a dud. Although President Roosevelt carried the State by 87,467, so great was the machine handicap

for McDaniel that he lost to his Republican opponent, Forrest C. Donnell, by the slim margin of 3,613 on the official return. It was the first time a Republican Governor had been elected in Missouri in 12 years.

This was a devastating blow to the machine leaders. All their plans were wrecked. Loss of the governorship meant they were deprived of the huge patronage of the Governor's office, patronage being a vital necessity for the maintenance of a political machine, and that they were deprived of the many financial favors which flow from a Governor to those who serve the party organization.

In a desperate situation, they decided upon a desperate course. In the forlorn hope of saving themselves, they wrecked their party organization in city and State, and threw out of jobs in St. Louis many thousand loyal followers. The leaders themselves went scurrying to Washington to see what the national administration could do for them. Dickmann landed quickly with the job of inspector general in the Office of Civilian Defense, but that job recently was abolished, and he is again on the waiting list. Recently McDaniel landed himself a \$3,000 job as parole officer of the St. Louis circuit court. Hannegan is to be taken care of with the fat office of internal revenue collector. The chiefs in the machine had ways of looking out for themselves, but the men and women in the ranks are not that fortunate.

In whose mind first lodged the germ which gave birth to the partisan scheme to "steal" the governorship, to prevent Governor Donnell from taking office and to install McDaniel in his stead, has been held a closely guarded mystery, but it is known that the first overt step was taken November 13, only 10 days after the State election.

That first overt step was taken by none other than Hannegan. He called a conference of party leaders in a room in the De Soto Hotel for the purpose, as Dickmann later explained it, of "discussing what, if anything, should be done about the governorship." In that smoke-filled hideout gathered Dickmann and Hannegan, Senator Bennett Clark, Attorney General Roy McKittrick, Secretary of State Dwight H. Brown, Chairman Charles M. Hay of the St. Louis Board of Election Commissioners, Probate Judge Glendy B. Arnold, Chairman C. Marion Hulen of the Democratic State Committee, State Senator Michael Kinney of St. Louis, and others.

They discussed the catastrophe which had overtaken the machine and they reached a decision, not unanimously, but by sufficient strength for State Chairman Hulen to proceed with the approval of the machine. Those in attendance never have admitted that this decision was anything more than an authorization for Hulen to make an investigation to determine whether there was evidence of fraud and election irregularities which would justify the institution of a contest. But the fact is that from that moment the plot to seize control of the Governor's office was in full swing.

COULD NOT SAY THEY HAD NOT BEEN WARNED

When the plot failed, with its consequent repudiation of Dickmann and Hannegan, they could not say that they had not been warned. Sitting in the haze of the curling blue smoke, listening and taking little part in the discussion of plans, was Attorney General McKittrick, who is noted for a political sagacity acquired through years of rough and tumble campaigning in his native Chariton County. The course of many a political conference has been changed by one homely comment by McKittrick.

As the discussion went more and more into detail, McKittrick changed his seat a time or two until he was off in a corner almost by himself. About all that was to be said about the plans had been concluded. Hannegan

was summing up, when McKittrick interrupted and said:

"One thing you fellows in St. Louis should consider carefully: If you go into this, you will be the ones under the gun. You city fellows have a city election in the spring, while we country boys will have 2 years to get over it before we have an election."

The stage was set, however, and McKittrick's warning went unheeded. The political mind could easily hold the idea that nothing could go wrong with the plans, so long as the Democrats controlled both branches of the legislature. They would simply have the legislature vote McDaniel in and Donnell out, and that would be all there would be to it.

And, with the carrying out of the scheme, what had the machine in St. Louis to fear in the spring election? Would it not control both the board of election commissioners and the board of police commissioners? What more would be needed to reelect Mayor Dickmann?

State Chairman Hulen, the front man for the State machine, immediately put into motion the forces necessary, as it was thought, to lay the groundwork for carrying out the plan, and to get the sorely needed support of the entire Democratic organization in the State. Ten lawyers were employed to gather evidence of "Republican frauds," Democratic job holders in St. Louis, Jefferson City, and throughout the State began to pour in reports. In 6 short weeks Hulen was primed.

At a meeting of the Democratic State committee in Jefferson City December 30, Hulen solemnly announced he had sufficient evidence to show that McDaniel had been elected and that Republican frauds had resulted in McDaniel being counted out. But he did not produce an iota of his evidence for the committee. He had a bulky brief case, which he said "contained the evidence," and he even loosened one strap of the brief case, but he didn't get it opened. The State committee took his word for it and adopted a resolution calling for "a general and sweeping investigation of the election."

It also asked that the local Democratic committees throughout the State adopt resolutions to be addressed to the legislature, urging the investigation.

HANNEGAN READY AND EAGER FOR HIS ROLE

Hannegan not only was ready but also eager for his role in St. Louis. As chairman of the Democratic city committee, he called the city committee into session just 4 days later, January 3, 1941, at the Jefferson Hotel. Again no evidence of fraud was presented, but Hannegan explained that the State committee desired the adoption of a resolution which had been prepared in advance. Forty-nine of the 56 members of the city committee were present and unanimously followed Hannegan's advice and adopted the resolution.

The scheme for an "investigation," as distinguished from a "contest," was a slick political trick. It called for a legislative committee to be controlled by Democrats, which would have the power to hear such evidence as it wanted to hear and exclude such evidence as it didn't want to hear, and to examine only such ballots as it wanted to examine, and to make its report to a Democratic legislature. Its report would be approved or rejected, the machine leaders seemingly having no fear of a rejection.

Of supreme importance in the plot was the fact that it would prevent the inauguration of Governor Donnell on January 13, the date fixed in the State constitution.

JUST ONE SLIP IN SCHEMING

There was just one slip in the scheming. The machine did not take into consideration the Missouri Supreme Court, or if it did, was so naive as to think it could count on a

solidly Democratic supreme court to throw in with it. It was the supreme court, acting with high judicial integrity, which caused the collapse of the whole plan.

If there was any honest doubt in the minds of any of the Democratic leaders that Governor Donnell had been elected, the proper legal course to have followed was for McDaniel to file a contest petition with the legislature, provision for which is made in the constitution. The supreme court so held when Donnell instituted proceedings to stop the illegal investigation. That, however, was what the machine did not want. For that would have provided for opening all of the ballot boxes, and Donnell would have been seated as Governor pending the outcome.

The legislature boldly attempted to play the part cut out for it by the machine. At a stormy all-night session January 11, and over the protest of a few Democratic members, it adopted the investigation resolution. There came an almost instantaneous blast of disapproval from throughout the State.

Leading Democrats—Gov. Lloyd C. Stark, Congressman John J. Cochran, State Senator Allen McReynolds, of Carthage; State Senator Michael Kinney, of St. Louis, and others—denounced the scheme as illegal and insisted that the only legal course would be to follow the constitution with a straight-out contest, seat the Governor, and proceed in an orderly manner.

FOUR WERE STRANGELY SILENT

Strangely silent were Senator Clark, Senator Truman, Mayor Dickmann, and the city chairman, Hannegan. None had even a suggestion of criticism of the scheme. They were mute, awaiting results.

Four days after the resolution was adopted by the legislature, and the aroused fury of Democrats as well as Republicans over the attempted steal had become evident, Hannegan issued a statement advocating the counting of all ballots but persisting in demanding a partisan inquiry and decision.

Governor Stark said, "All the able constitutional lawyers I have talked with agree that the duly elected Governor (Donnell, the Republican) should be seated as required by the constitution, and the contest, if any, then be carried out according to the constitution."

Congressman COCHRAN said, "Unless the will of the people is carried out there will be a break-down in our form of government."

State Senator McReynolds said, "It is the duty of the majority (the Democrats in the legislature) to observe the exact language of the constitution."

State Senator Kinney said, "We should follow the Governor's advice and proceed in an orderly, constitutional way."

Clark, Truman, and Dickmann said nothing. Hannegan continued to stand for a narrow, partisan decision.

Governor Stark on January 15 threw the machine leaders into a state of consternation by the unprecedented action of vetoing the "investigation" resolution passed by the legislature. No governor ever before had exercised the power of veto over a legislative resolution. The machine leaders and the legislative leaders who had been charged with the spadework of carrying out the machine orders were thunderstruck.

SCHEMERS EDGING AWAY

Governor Stark's veto message terrorized the machine leaders, and they began to edge away from an appearance of participation in the scheme. They began to itch and squirm, and, looking forward to the city election in St. Louis, in which Dickmann was a candidate for mayor for the third time, they began to seek a way to calm the tumult.

It became common talk in St. Louis and throughout the State that the governorship contest would mean Mayor Dickmann's defeat. The machine leaders recalled—but, alas, too late—the words of homely wisdom uttered by Attorney General McKittrick 2 months earlier

in the smoke haze of the DeSoto Hotel hide-out—"You city fellows have a city election in the spring, while we country boys will have 2 years to get over it before we have an election."

Governor Stark said in his veto message:

"Leaving out of account any discussion of the constitutional problem, which is now out of my hands (it had been taken to the supreme court by Donnell), I am of the opinion that the principles of good government and fair play dictate that the candidate (Donnell, the Republican) receiving the highest number of votes in the returns published by the secretary of state, should be seated, and the contest proceed in a legal and proper manner."

CLARK BREAKS SILENCE

Senator CLARK, in Washington, finally broke his silence after the State was aroused to fever heat. The mayoralty election was then only 10 weeks off. He spoke, but vaguely, and in generalities: "I certainly think that under no circumstances should the contest on the governorship be made in a partisan manner. Just because the Democrats have a majority in the legislature is no reason for throwing Donnell out. On the other hand, if McDaniel was elected, he should be seated. As to the legal aspects of the case, I must decline to give an offhand opinion."

However, State Senator McReynolds, a lawyer of recognized ability, had not hesitated to express the legal opinion that the course being pursued was illegal. Governor Stark, acting on legal advice, had not hesitated to declare it illegal. The Supreme Court, deciding the case, specifically held that it was illegal.

The wishy-washy statements by the machine leaders and Senator CLARK served to increase the public clamor for fairness, but the party leaders held their ground, continuing their plans, if not with the same degree of openness, to carry out the original scheme, but stopped for the time being by the supreme court, to which Donnell had appealed. The supreme court, in accepting jurisdiction of the case, had directed that all proceedings be held up until its final decision.

By the latter part of January, while the supreme court was considering the issue, the first noticeable evidence that the machine leaders were thoroughly scared of the effect of the contest on Dickmann's chance for reelection appeared in Jefferson City. St. Louis members of the legislature, who, with the exception of Senator Kinney from the beginning and Senator Clinton T. Watson later, began to soften in their support and showed signs of abandoning the stand they had taken. One of them said: "To hell with the governorship if this thing's going to beat Barney."

ANOTHER HOTEL MEETING

The real break came late in January when State Senator L. N. Searcy of Eminence, chairman of the "investigating" committee, was summoned to another hotel conference in St. Louis. It was held at the Coronado Hotel. In addition to Searcy, one or two other members of the legislative committee were there to meet Hannegan and some of his St. Louis machine cohorts. Hannegan by that time had become convinced that the fight was endangering Dickmann and he knew that Dickmann's defeat would mean the immediate collapse of the machine on which they had so laboriously toiled for 8 years.

At the Coronado Hotel conference, Hannegan sought to abandon the governorship steal, advising Searcy that nothing more should be done to carry out the detailed plans of the original cabal; that the "investigation" should be halted; that Governor Donnell should be seated.

But those who had been charged with the legislative responsibility at Jefferson City were in no mood to quit. Whatever their

doubts in the beginning, they had gone so far that they were not willing to back-track. Senator Searcy returned to the capital determined to recklessly brazen it through.

However, he was not given the opportunity. The supreme court declined the matter for him. On February 19 the court ordered that Governor Donnell be seated, holding that a "contest" under the constitution was the proper mode of procedure.

The supreme court left the schemers only the foothold for starting all over again with a legal contest. Governor Donnell was inaugurated February 26, and shortly afterward a contest petition was filed by McDaniel with only the half-hearted support of the machine and the legislative leaders most active in the original proceeding. The schemers really had no hope of sustaining a contest, but a recount of the ballots was begun. As the returns came in, it was evident that if there had been frauds and irregularities, they had been in McDaniel's favor rather than Donnell's. The indications soon were that a completed recount would show that Donnell had been elected by a majority in excess of 10,000, instead of the 3,613 shown by the original returns.

Even in the face of this situation, it was not until May 21 that McDaniel abandoned hope that through some quirk of fate the cards would fall his way, although long before that the originators of the plot had lost interest in it. For Dickmann had been defeated for reelection in the April election. The Republicans had control of the city hall. Nearly all the St. Louis machine Democrats were out of jobs, and there was no rift in the clouds for the Democrats in the contest. So on May 21, McDaniel asked the legislature to dismiss his contest which, he said, he had instituted "with the highest motives," and "with the firm conviction that I had in truth and in fact been elected Governor."

So ended the most gigantic attempted political steal in the history of the State. Dickmann and Hannegan became job hunters instead of job dispensers. What its effect will be on Senator CLARK when he seeks reelection 2 years hence is for disclosure in the still somewhat remote future. As for the immediate future, it seems reasonably certain that while the people kicked Dickmann out, the President and the Democratic majority in the United States Senate are about to put Hannegan in.

The St. Louis Star-Times has also published an editorial on this subject. While the Star-Times is a competing paper and does not fully agree with the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, it still agrees that this is no time, nor is any other period of good government a time, for picking up broken-down political hacks who have been discredited by the people and putting them on the Federal pay roll.

The editorial appearing in the Star-Times is as follows:

THE HANNEGAN ISSUE IN PERSPECTIVE

Robert E. Hannegan, former chairman of the Democratic city committee, should not receive the appointment of collector of internal revenue. His political record, and particularly the fact that his appointment would merely follow the patronage tradition, disqualify him for this position.

But the question of the Hannegan appointment has been made the subject for an attack so unbridled and so extreme that the attack itself has become a fit matter for public comment. It is of the most vital importance, when newspapers employ the powerful medium of type to denounce and condemn men and to sway the popular mind, that fair play and a proper sense of proportion be preserved.

In this case there has been a departure from these standards, and the public is being

imposed upon. There is something distorted, something awry, in the spectacle of a newspaper plausibly invoking last year's gubernatorial "conspiracy" as the basis for an attack upon Mr. Hannegan while that same newspaper remains silent upon this year's merit-system grab in St. Louis.

The Democrats failed in their plot to seize the governorship. All the papers of Missouri combined against that "steal," but the Becker administration is succeeding in robbing the people of the merit-system law, in setting aside its operations and in continuing the abuses of patronage, spoils, and the lug, which the voters thought they were outlawing last September.

What is happening at St. Louis' City Hall today in the setting aside of the merit system constitutes a deadly blow to democratic processes in St. Louis. The public is being gulled when one of its newspapers blinds it with exclamatory headlines about a gubernatorial steal, thereby distracting it from the present-day merit-system grab, which is threatening its well-being more even than would the appointment of Mr. Hannegan as collector of revenues.

There are few cities in the country where politicians could have committed the outrage that has been committed in the merit-system hoax and not receive the united denunciation of the entire press.

Moreover, it is a simple canon of fair play that participants in the same plot shall be treated to equal condemnation. Former Mayor Dickmann and Lawrence McDaniel were involved in the gubernatorial fiasco as deeply as was Mr. Hannegan. Yet the newspaper which is so loudly denouncing Mr. Hannegan had this to say of Mr. Dickmann when he was appointed inspector general in the Office of Civilian Defense:

"Mayor LaGuardia has made an excellent choice in appointing Bernard F. Dickmann as inspector general. * * * His talents should be well used."

The same newspaper also commented in a kindly vein on McDaniel, when he recently was named parole officer of the circuit court, as follows:

"Well versed in criminal law and possessing an unusual human warmth, Mr. McDaniel has notable personal equipment for the work which he will do."

To be sure, the memory of the people is short, but they should not be exploited for this reason. Selective persecution is not palatable. If two perpetrators of a plot are to be forgiven and treated mercifully, it is incongruous and shabby to assail a third perpetrator with nearly every form of journalistic extremism.

The Star-Times is opposed to the Hannegan appointment, on the basis of Hannegan's whole record—not simply the gubernatorial scandal. But it is also opposed to the inconsistency of meting out cruel and unusual treatment to only one member of a triumvirate which was guilty of a joint offense. It is also opposed to studied preoccupation with yesterday's steal when every courageous organ of public opinion should be engaged in recovering for the people the merit system which they voted into effect last September and which is now being withheld from them.

The performance of the Becker administration is smothering the merit system is the great menace of machine politics facing St. Louis, and it will not be banished by the magician's trick of diverting our attention to the sins of a former administration.

You will note that the Post Dispatch points out that one of the curious inconsistencies of life in democratic America is the blind and unreasoning loyalty to party which so frequently takes precedence over loyalty to the public interest and, in many instances, loyalty to public decency. It also points out that

immediately after the citizens of St. Louis had discredited this machine in the mayoralty election in which they elected our present very able mayor, Mr. William D. Becker, the Office of Civilian Defense picked up the discredited and defeated mayor, Bernard Dickman, and put him in a \$6,500 job with the dancers and fancy pool-shot artists and the bowling experts and the various other social-service workers of the Office of Civilian Defense. For a great part of his stay at O. C. D., St. Louis believed him to be a dollar-a-year man. It was not revealed that he was on a salary of \$6,500 a year, until this very House of Representatives exposed him. Then he went out of the \$6,500 job and into a job that paid \$22 a day, I believe, for expenses.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Did he have charge of any of the ping-pong work that I understand is a part of the matter under investigation in the O. C. D.?

Mr. PLOESER. I do not believe this particular gentleman did. I do not know what his ability is in the line of ping-pong.

Mr. DITTER. That is a pretty fast game.

Mr. PLOESER. It is a pretty fast game. Well, this Dickmann-Hannegan machine crowd play a pretty fast game, too.

Mr. DITTER. I mean ping-pong is a pretty fast game.

Mr. PLOESER. Now we have a situation where it is being recommended to the President that he appoint this man, and it is understood by the good citizens of St. Louis and the newspapers and the rest of us who are interested in decent government in the city of St. Louis, that the President is about to appoint Robert Hannegan, who was the chairman of this vote-stealing and vote-padding machine, who in his own home was caught with padded registrations, and who was the ringleader of the group that tried to steal the governorship, to the \$7,000 post of collector of internal revenue.

I understand that our illustrious Senators are approving this appointment. I bring this matter onto the floor of the House in the hope that in some manner my feeble voice may penetrate these walls and reach into the other body with such appeal to these distinguished Senators from the State of Missouri that they change their opinion and not foist this great public affront onto the people of the city of St. Louis. This is directly an insult to the intelligence of the voters of St. Louis. They have just recently discredited this entire gang, and now we are to understand that the Federal Government is to give them fat political plums for their services in the past. Surely the Democratic Party must have some decent and capable citizens who would be eligible for such appointments.

I cannot see anything else but what the civil service in the Internal Revenue Bureau of St. Louis would be in direct jeopardy if we appointed a man such as this to head that Department. I am hopeful that the citizens of St. Louis,

should this appointment go through, will rise in righteous wrath and denounce everyone who has anything to do with it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States Navy Department in an official release this week disclosed the identity of the Negro sailor who manned the machine gun on a battleship at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, though he had theretofore been confined to the duties of a second-class mess attendant.

The communication stated:

In company with two officers and several enlisted men, Dorie Miller, second-class mess attendant, was on the signal bridge of a United States battleship when the commanding officer of the vessel received a fatal abdominal wound. While others sought to construct a stretcher to lower the captain to a safer location, a Naval Reserve lieutenant and Miller manned a pair of machine guns and fired upon the attacking planes until fires started by bombs rendered the machine guns useless.

Unable to lower their captain on an improvised stretcher, four officers and men, including Miller, carried him from the blazing bridge of the ship to the more sheltered deck under the portside antiaircraft guns.

Dying, the captain ordered the officers and men to abandon ship. Finding other means of escape blocked because of flames, they made their way to shore, hand over hand, along lines strung deckward from a boat crane.

Since those tragic hours on the Sabbath of December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, 12,000,000 Negro citizens have with pardonable pride rejoiced in the feat of the unnamed colored hero who was mentioned in news releases at the time.

There has been a fruitless but untiring effort to learn his identity, especially by the Washington staff of the Pittsburgh Courier, the most widely circulated weekly Negro publication in the United States.

This week the Pittsburgh Courier, issue of March 14, 1942, on the front page carries the first picture of Dorie Miller and the "young woman he left behind, Miss Mozelle Alexander, of Flint, Texas."

The following Washington dispatch in the Pittsburgh Courier outlines the first official news of this colored sailor's brave conduct under fire.

MESS ATTENDANT TURNED MACHINE GUN ON JAPANESE

Washington, D. C., March 12.—Add the name of Dorie Miller, 22-year-old mess attendant in the United States Navy, to the illustrious "honor roll" of Negro fighting heroes, who have inscribed their names in the red ink of raw courage, from Bunker Hill to Metz.

Add the name of Dorie Miller, Texas born and Texas raised, to the "phantom brigade" of fighting black men, whose deeds have become immortalized in the record book of American history.

JOINS LONG LIST OF HEROES

Add the name of Dorie Miller, son of a land-anchored family to those men of years ago, who have walked through the Valhalla of death as American patriots. Chrispus Attucks, Needham Roberts, Henry Johnson, Sgt. William H. Carney, the six men at Arlington Cemetery who died as heroes in the Mexican uprising at Carrizal.

Add the name of Dorie Miller to the glowing achievements of the Ninth Cavalry in the Boxer Rebellion, the Rough Riders at San-

tiago, the Ninety-second and the provisional Ninety-third Divisions during World War No. 1.

Because it was Dorie Miller, third son of a Waco, Tex., family, who manned the machine gun during the infamous sneak attack of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor on the morning of Sunday, December 7, 1941, and became the "Unnamed Negro messman hero." No longer is his name unknown.

NAVY CONFIRMS COURIER STORY

Following weeks and months of intensive effort, in which every possible lead was run down, the Pittsburgh Courier this week announced to America and linked the name of Dorie Miller with the magnificently courageous part he played. Starkly dramatic is the official communique which the Courier obtained last week from unimpeachable sources and which has been verified by the Navy Department, as follows:

"At the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor, Mess Attendant Miller, in company with two officers and several enlisted men, was on the signal bridge of a battleship.

"When the battleship was attacked, the commanding officer received what was to prove a fatal abdominal wound. While others attempted to provide a stretcher on which to lower their commanding officer, to a less exposed position, Miller and a lieutenant manned a pair of machine guns and fired upon the enemy aircraft.

"They maintained their fire until the machine guns were put out of action by the encroaching flames from numerous blazes set by enemy bombs.

ORDERED TO ABANDON SHIP

"Unable to improvise a stretcher, the officers and enlisted men, including Miller, managed somehow to carry their captain to the deck and the shelter of an antiaircraft gun, located on the port side of the vessel. Dying, the captain ordered all hands to abandon ship.

"Flames made usual means of leaving the ship impossible, but Miller and the others finally succeeded in getting to shore by climbing hand over hand down ropes dangling from an overhead crane."

Thus is revealed the first Negro hero of World War No. 2—the first Negro naval hero and the youth who for months has been referred to by white columnists and radio announcers as the "unnamed Negro messman hero."

Woven through the lines and sentences of the communique is a story far more dramatic than that which has been printed.

ASSIGNED ONLY TO MENIAL JOBS

Dorie Miller was born on October 12 (Columbus Day), 1919, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Conery Miller. He is the third son of a family of four boys.

Upon completing his elementary and high-school education, he enlisted in the Navy on September 16, 1939, just before reaching his twentieth birthday.

When Dorie enlisted, however, he was allowed to enlist only in the rank of messman. He served meals, cleaned up after the officers, and did the menial work which is the role of Negro messmen throughout the Navy.

When the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor occurred over 2 years after Dorie had enlisted, he was still a messman. (In the Navy, you know, a Negro finds it difficult to advance to the higher grades of seamanship but has been confined largely to the role of mess attendant.)

FIRST TIME TO FIRE GUN

Dorie had never fired a machine gun before. (Navy policy wouldn't give a messman the opportunity to learn the intricacies of this weapon.)

But when the surprise sneak attack occurred, the fighting instinct and the burning patriotism which smoldered deep down inside the youth, burst into brilliant flame.

Dorie Miller, a Negro American, became a reincarnation of those Negro heroes of other years.

It was as natural for Dorie Miller to grab that machine gun and to start its stuttering messages of death leaping toward the Rising Sun emblems he could see on those diving enemy planes, as it was for any other American.

It was natural for him to remain at his post until leaping flames forced him to retreat.

To Dorie Miller, son of the Lone Star State, a real sailor, an American fighting man, no longer an unnamed hero: America salutes you.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper for the House of Representatives to honor American soldiers and sailors regardless of race, color, or creed.

Dorie Miller should be voted the Congressional Medal of Honor or any other citation in keeping with the great traditions of the United States Navy.

The Pittsburgh Courier, the National Negro Council, the National Baptist Convention, the Methodist, and other church leaders and laity representation of the 12,000,000 loyal and patriotic Negro people will be cheered by this recognition of one of their own by the Congress, the United States House of Representatives and the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a resolution of the Italia Moderna Society, of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a brief excerpt from a statement issued by Hon. George P. Alderson, State Tax Commissioner of West Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, we are all acutely aware of the report brought back to the United States by Admiral Hart, from the Pacific fighting zone, wherein he says, in effect, "too little, too late."

We have once again been told that we must have air power and it must be at the scene of action if we are to expect victory in the future. While we are thinking in terms of superiority in the skies on the fighting fronts we must not forget that the domestic air transportation system of America is vital. We have now only 350 transports which could be converted into troop-carrying planes, which would take care of 6,000 men. The only way we could carry those 6,000 troops to a point of attack on this country quickly is by this method. I trust the

policy now being pursued of taking the domestic planes and putting them into the fighting service abroad will not be continued to the point where it will weaken America at home. We must realize that our enemies might conceivably attack at some particular point in the United States. Our domestic air lines are performing highly valuable service on the home front. They stand ready for any emergency and can be converted to wartime units. I am placing in the Appendix of today's RECORD my feelings about the necessity for a helpful attitude toward the air transportation carriers of this country. I trust my colleagues will join in a constructive encouragement of this industry—which contributes valuable experience, research, equipment, and personnel in time of war and which shall play a vital part in winning commerce and good will in the peace which will follow.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD (at the request of Mr. Voorhis of California) for 2 days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., the House adjourned to meet (in accordance with its previous order) on Monday, March 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, April 14, 1942. Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1487. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

1488. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of payees receiving payments in excess of \$1,000 under the 1940 agricultural conservation program, range conservation program, naval stores conservation program, and payment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1489. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1490. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list

of the oil and gas leases which by their terms would expire in 1941, but by reason of their inclusion in an approved unit plan are extended beyond their initial 20-year term, until the termination of such plan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1491. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 666); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1492. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 in the amount of \$18,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 667); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANDIS: Committee on Labor. H. R. 5580. A bill to prohibit subversive individuals from representing employees for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 6783. A bill granting a pension of \$50 per month to all widows of Civil War veterans who have attained or hereafter attain the age of 65 years; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 6784. A bill to prohibit the movement in interstate commerce of packages of food not of the standard units of weight or measure herein prescribed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6785. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit the radio advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 292 (by request). Joint resolution to designate the composition known as Onward Christian Soldiers as the national war song of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution providing for the commemoration on March 16, 1942, of the anniversary of the birth of President James Madison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 6786. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Peterson Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 6787. A bill for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6788. A bill for the relief of Lily Pao-Nu Cheng Chong; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2554. By Mr. GAVAGAN: Petition of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; to the Committee on Rules

2555. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D. C., concerning House bill 6256, known as the Citizen Identification Act of 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2556. Also, petition of the National Youth Administration College Work Council for the City of New York and Long Island, favoring the continuance of the National Youth Administration college work program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2557. By The SPEAKER: Petition of the Southwest Civic Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Alley Dwelling Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 5, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Right Reverend James Hutchison Cockburn, D. D., moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, minister of Dunblane Cathedral, Scotland, offered the following prayer:

O God, whose is the kingdom and the power, as the eye of a servant looks to the hand of his master, so we, Thy servants, turn our hearts to Thee. In Thee is our help and our defense; from Thee come wisdom and understanding; by Thee we live and move and have our being. Thy loving kindness is ever about us and Thou providest for our needs in due season, so that our souls are glad in Thee and we Thy children know that we can wait patiently on Thee from whom cometh our salvation. Keep us, we pray Thee, by Thy mighty power, and uphold us by Thy free spirit, that no earthly power may hold us in fear, and no untoward happening distress us, that we, being rooted and grounded in faith and stayed on the rock of Thy strength, may be steadfast and unmovable. Through cloud and sunshine may we abide in Thee, whose is the kingdom and the power forever.

Eternal Father, who rulest the rulers of the earth, look favorably, we beseech Thee, on the President of this commonwealth and on all his household; give him wise judgment, quick decision, and a spirit to seek Thy praise. Upon the Vice President, the members of the Cabinet, and all who have been called to the office of this Senate, pour out Thy grace which alone maketh rich, and give them the gladness of them that serve the people and Thee. Bless abundantly the people of this land, accept their sacrifices and prosper them in Thy ways. Keep in Thy faith and fear their sailors, soldiers, and airmen; sustain them and the rulers, the peoples, and the armed forces of those who are allied with them in a noble cause; strengthen them with the

assurance of victory, and by their abundant labors, by their endurance, courage, and trust in Thee, restore peace to our broken world, that Thy kingdom may be advanced. We ask this in Christ's name, who alone is the Redeemer of the world.

And now, as Thy servants take up their appointed tasks, give them, we pray Thee, the comfort of Thy guiding counsel, that no selfish passion may hinder them from knowing Thy will, no weakness from doing it, that in Thy light they may see light clearly and in Thy service find perfect freedom; through the Spirit of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, to whom, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, be everlasting praise.

The grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 13, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2249) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy, additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been informed that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], because of illness, is desirous of resigning as a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, and the Chair appoints the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] to fill the vacancy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated.

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. L. Keller, of Warren, Pa., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Finance:

"GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

"House Joint Resolution 37

"To memorialize Congress concerning taxes on hard liquors

"Whereas Virginia has been compelled, in the control of hard liquors, to increase the sale price from time to time, both to meet the increasingly heavy Federal taxes levied thereon and also to insure some margin of profit to this Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the high price at which Virginia is now compelled to make such sales has greatly encouraged the illegal manufacture and sale of such liquors in this Commonwealth, and, consequently, greatly increased the cost and expense of her effort to enforce the laws against such illegal manufacture and sale; and

"Whereas Virginia has been compelled to pass an act at the present session of the general assembly reducing the taxes heretofore imposed upon such liquors in order to discourage, as far as possible, such illegal manufacture and sale, such reduction in tax affecting the returns from such sales to so great an extent that the Commonwealth will not hereafter be able to sell such liquors at such prices as will produce the margin of profit to which she is justly entitled: Now, therefore—

"1. Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized to refrain from imposing any additional taxes upon hard liquors in order that Virginia and other States may be able to sell such liquors at prices that will discourage, rather than encourage, the illegal manufacture and sale of such liquors.

"2. Be it further resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted by the clerk of the house of delegates to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, and to each member of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Agreed to by the house of delegates, March 12, 1942.

"E. GRIFFITH DODSON,

"Clerk.

"Agreed to by the senate, March 12, 1942.

"E. R. COMBS,

"Clerk."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Abilene, Kans., praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2305. A bill to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169).

By Mr. REYNOLDS from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2344. A bill to limit the initial base pay of \$21 a month for enlisted men in the Army and Marine Corps to those of the seventh grade; without amendment (Rept. No. 1170); and

S. 2352. A bill to provide a penalty for violation of restrictions or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, or leaving military areas or zones; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1171).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs: